3 1761 05187 569 8

Shaftesbury SP7 9QP
Music and Music Literature

CHAPTERS ON CHURCH MUSIC.

CHAPTERS

ON

CHURCH MUSIC.

BY

REV. R. B. DANIEL,

Formerly Organist of the Parish Churches of St. Mary Bredin and St. Mary Bredman, Canterbury; and Curate of Tickenhall, Derby.

'Enter into His gates with thanksgiving, and into His courts with praise.'
PSALM C. 4.

LONDON:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
1894.

'Praise the Lord ; for the Lord is good : sing praises unto His name ; for it is pleasant.'

PSALM CXXXV. 3.

'The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads.'

ISAIAH XXXV. 10.

TO THE

VERY REVEREND

ROBERT PAYNE-SMITH, D.D.,

DEAN OF CANTERBURY,

This Essay

IS (BY PERMISSION) RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY HIS

OBLIGED AND GRATEFUL SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

THE present volume is an attempt to treat Church music as considered not only from an artistic, but also from a devotional and a practical point of view.

Church music is a large subject, and one upon which opinions widely differ. If it were always regarded from both a musical and a devotional point of view, there would probably be more agreement on the subject. But this is seldom the case. Many people seem either to hold Church music to be an important branch of the musical art, and nothing more; or to regard it as only a kind of devotional exercise. The existence of two separate theories of Church music (the one purely musical, the other purely devotional) would be sufficient to account for the want of uniformity in the quantity, the quality, and the kind of music used in our churches—even if there were no other causes working to divide men on the subject. Truly there is great variety in our Church music, in the manner of its performance, and in the use that is made of the musical art at different churches. At some churches only the most florid Anglican chants are used; while at others only 'Gregorians' are permitted, or the Canticles are sung to service-music. At some churches hymn-tunes of poor quality are often used; at others the music is always high in character. At some churches the services are rendered musically throughout by a select company of trained choristers; at others only the Canticles and a few hymns are sung by the congregation. At some churches the singing, choral and congregational, is

excellent, and the organ accompaniment masterly; at others the singing is very bad, and the accompaniment poor and feeble. Even organ voluntaries differ in character and in performance: some organists playing light, 'popular' pieces; while others make the instrument speak grand and beautiful music, and never use it but in a devotional, churchlike style.

It is the design of the author to take as comprehensive a view of the subject as he can within reasonable limits—to consider what quality, kind, and quantity of music seem fittest to be used in parish church services; to offer suggestions on organs, organists, choirs, and choristers; to discuss the question of the choice and direction of the music; to point out where the musical arrangements of churches and the rendering of the music are sometimes faulty, and suggest how they may be improved; and to enter into many other matters of interest which belong to his subject. Some notes on Metrical Psalmody and the History of Church Music, and other matters which, it is hoped, will be found not uninteresting, have been thrown into an Appendix; also a paper on Examinations in Literary Work for Musicians, in which it is sought to show that while the Universities expect too much of candidates for musical degrees, the importance of a fair general education for church organists might, with advantage, be more generally recognised by the councils of musical colleges. His desire to see the professional organist's *status* improved must be the author's apology for inserting a paper treating of matters which perhaps do not belong very directly to the subject of Church music.

While it has been sought to make the book useful to clergymen and young organists, it will, it is hoped, be found to contain much that will interest non-clerical and non-professional readers.

The author, while he holds that music is a delightful and excellent thing, believes that it should be suitable in kind, and used in moderation in the Church services. He does not advocate a performance of Divine service by a clergyman and a number of trained singers. The Cathedral service—which someone has called 'the most delightful and elevating in the

world'—he would use only in those stately buildings for which it was originally intended, and where only it can be rendered with proper effect. He ventures to think that the services at parish churches should be of such a kind as not to be beyond the understanding of the common people, to the greater part of whom an elaborate musical service must necessarily be a stumbling-block, and (is there not reason to fear?) a hindrance to that intelligent and spiritual worship which alone can profit a congregation. But while he recommends simplicity and heartiness in public worship, he does not believe that Church music should be treated as a thing of little importance and rendered in slovenly fashion. He would have the music high in character; it should be led by a good choir, and supported and beautified by the artistic and devotional accompaniment of a good organ; and yet, with the exception of the anthem (which is not congregational music), it should be such as the people can understand and take part in. He has formed this opinion after hearing Church music as it is rendered in many countries and in churches of different communions: the peculiar but impressive music of the Greek Church, sung by the deep voices of Russians; the delightful, artistic music of the Roman Church, performed by choice singers and a band and chorus; and the grand congregational singing, with a magnificent organ accompaniment, to be heard in such perfection in the Lutheran churches of Germany.

Some of the following chapters are reprinted from the *Musical World* and the *Musical Standard*—to which the author has been an occasional contributor. But as these have been revised and partly re-written, and many of the chapters now appear for the first time, the musical journals mentioned ought not to be held responsible for all the opinions expressed in the present volume.

In a book treating of Church music—a subject on which so many different opinions are held—it can hardly be but that much will appear that will fail to satisfy *all* readers. Neither clergymen nor organists will agree with all that is written. Many passages in the present volume will not be acceptable

to clergymen who hold extreme views; while others will not be received without dissent by organists who are enthusiastically fond of their delightful art. But the author, while he is opposed to the practices of the advanced school and the revival of Mediævalism in the Church, would express the hope that between Churchmen of *all* schools, although they work on such different lines, some mutual regard may yet exist. And if he has said that music is often employed much too freely in public worship, he can only regret that he is not so happy as to agree with those organists and clergymen who believe an elaborate musical service to be the best for use in parish churches.

Derby, 1894.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE MUSIC THAT SEEMS FITTEST FOR USE IN THE CHURCH SERVICES.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	HYMNS AND HYMN-TUNES	3
II.	CHORAL AND CONGREGATIONAL SERVICES	23
III.	CHANTS	54
IV.	GREGORIAN MUSIC	57

PART II.

THE ORGANIST AND HIS INSTRUMENT.

I.	THE PLACE FOR THE ORGAN (AND CHOIR)—WEST GALLERIES	67
II.	THE ORGAN	87
III.	THE ORGANIST	116
IV.	VOLUNTARIES	123
V.	THE USE OF THE ORGAN IN THE CHURCH SERVICES	131

PART III.

THE CHOIR.

I.	WOMEN AND BOYS IN CHURCH CHOIRS	145
II.	THE CHOIR	157

PART IV.

THE CHOICE AND DIRECTION OF THE MUSIC.

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE CHURCH MUSICAL STAFF - - - - 169

II. THE CLERGY AND CHURCH MUSIC - - - 178

APPENDICES.

A. SOME NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF CHURCH MUSIC—CHIEFLY FROM BURNEY - - - - - - 187

B. NOTES ON METRICAL PSALMODY—PARTLY FROM BURNEY - 197

C. NOTE ON THE MUSICAL ARRANGEMENTS AT FRENCH ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCHES - - - - - 205

D. EXAMINATIONS IN LITERARY WORK—ARTS TESTS - - 206

INDEX - - - - - - - - 212

PART I.

THE MUSIC THAT SEEMS FITTEST FOR USE IN THE CHURCH SERVICES.

'I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.'—1 Cor. xiv. 15.

CHAPTER I.

HYMNS AND HYMN-TUNES.

OF the many and conflicting opinions upon Church music, that which makes psalmody of a low type to be the best for congregational singing is certainly not one of the least erroneous.

The writer recently attended a service 'for men only,' at which the hymns and tunes were of the Salvation Army kind, and of such a childish character that the question suggested itself, 'This clergyman has invited "men only" to come to his service; why, then, does he not treat them as men?' Only a short time before this the writer had heard a clergyman say that he 'did not care whether the tunes used in his church were good musical compositions or not, if the people only sang them'—words not such as a lover of music would utter, but worthy of being recorded, as they express the views of a thoroughly earnest clergyman who, like many others, wishes to promote hearty congregational singing in his church, and thinks he can best do so by using music of a low, popular character. The present writer, while agreeing with these excellent clergymen that congregational singing ought to be encouraged, differs from them in one point: he would earnestly deprecate the use of other than good hymns and tunes in church; without urging that only classical compositions should be used, he would suggest that words and music that do not come up to a high standard of excellence are unworthy to be used in Divine service.

We may hope, and humbly believe, that He who gave men the genius to write beautiful hymns and tunes is graciously

pleased to accept these, as—though, indeed, they are poor enough—they are the best we have to offer. But can it be honouring Him, as He ought very highly to be honoured, when we offer anything but our very best in His house? The plea put forward for the miserable hymns and tunes which are sometimes used is, that these productions are well known and very singable, and therefore very fit for congregational use. And there is reason to fear that hymn-books containing an unusually large proportion of such hymns and tunes are favoured by many earnest clergymen, who wish to place before their congregations 'something that will make them sing.' Now, the utmost that can be conceded in favour of these low-class hymns and tunes is, that they are familiar to people who attend street services, and very fit for being bawled out by uncultured persons at 'revivals' and Salvation Army meetings. But surely a low, popular flavour in hymns and tunes does not recommend them for use in church. Surely nothing can justify the use of what is low in the worship of the Most High. On the ground of decency the use of such compositions is to be condemned. But clergymen who use them at their special services for the poor shut their eyes, and do not, or will not, see the indecency. The opinion that such hymns and tunes are especially suited for use by the poor is erroneous; for in these hymns the sense is no easier to grasp than in hymns of a better class, and the tunes are no easier to sing than tunes of a higher character. There are many good devotional hymns that are suitable for the use of the poor, and there are many good, hearty tunes that are so simple and melodious that, if not already known, they might speedily be learned; and there is no reason why these respectable hymns and tunes should not be as much enjoyed by the poor as others of a lower type. If beautiful and artistically written tunes were unmelodious, that *would* be a reason for discarding them and using the distressing, though perhaps more popular, compound of the ballad and Christy Minstrel styles at special services for our humbler brethren. But artistically written tunes are *not* unmelodious: they are more melodious, more vocal, than inferior music. The experience of everyone

teaches that tunes may be good music at once and thoroughly congregational. We have so much good and congregational music to choose from that (except, perhaps, in the case of hymns of very peculiar metre) there ought never to be a difficulty in finding a suitable tune for a hymn. So that it cannot be conceded that the use of low-class tunes is justified by necessity; and the theory that such tunes are the most congregational, and consequently the most suitable for special services, is false. Low-class psalmody unquestionably might be left in the street without inconveniencing the poor or robbing them of any spiritual benefit.

Our humbler brethren, when they attend church, do not require that the psalmody shall be of the poorest kind obtainable. They know very well that church service and street service are conducted very differently. A clergyman, in his desire to adapt himself to their want of culture, speaks very plainly, and uses homely language at special services for the poor; but he does not find it necessary to talk nonsense or use the dialect of his hearers. Nor does he copy the ritual of the 'Ranters' in his anxiety to have a simple form of service. He feels that the sermon and the service, though they cannot be too simple, must nevertheless be high in character. Then why, it may be asked, does he use a low-class psalmody? Is the character of the musical portion of the service a thing of no moment? Is it showing reverence, and teaching the people reverence, to introduce such nauseous tunes, as are often heard on these occasions, into a 'Holy and beautiful House,' and mingle them with the prayers of the Church?

But is it quite certain that the uncultured classes in England prefer low-class tunes to those of a better kind? If so, it is disgraceful. In the German churches the people join in singing the *choräle*. They are familiar with these, the highest and purest form of psalm-tunes, and never hear any low-class music in their churches. Consequently high-class psalmody is popular. If our English poor are so much behind the German in musical taste that they delight in psalmody of the very lowest kind, ought they to be allowed to remain so? Ought our clergymen to cling to the mistaken, but only too pre-

valent belief that hymns and tunes of the Moody and Sankey type are better adapted to the requirements of their humbler brethren than a purer psalmody? Ought they not rather—when it could so easily be done—to improve the taste of the people by accustoming their congregations to what is sound and good?

To the writer it is quite astonishing to find clergymen using a low-class psalmody in any of the services (whether ordinary or special) of the Church. How men of culture can ask their congregations, even if poor and ignorant, to sing a hymn like that with the refrain 'Let some droppings,' is a mystery. It is to be hoped that the number of clergymen who like such hymns and refrains is small; though the writer heard a clergyman say he *loved* them. It would be sad indeed if clergymen generally introduced them, and good, healthy psalmody were eventually driven out of church to make room for hymns and tunes of the lowest type. But is it utterly impossible that such a consummation might be reached, if the use of such productions were continued much longer? Perhaps it may be necessary even for people of culture, if they would retain the taste for what is noble and elevating, to avoid all contact with what is low and degrading.

While most musical professors and amateurs will be of opinion that simple hymns and tunes are the best for use in church, none will hold the character of the psalmody to be a matter of indifference.

To pass on to the hymns used in the ordinary services of the Church. It must be confessed that not a few of the hymns in our modern collections are unsatisfactory. In many of them there are too much extravagant sentimentality, too much subjectivity, and too much of the sensational element. Sometimes the language is too familiar, sometimes it is too high-flown, sometimes it is even amorous. In one hymn the amorous element largely figures. Sometimes the language is absurd. There is a hymn which gravely narrates the virtues of a deceased matron; but probably no one would wish to hear it sung in memory of his wife. Some hymns contain incorrect statements. Is it true that 'We are not

divided, all one body we, one in hope and doctrine, one in charity'?* If so, why does another hymn speak of the Church as 'By schisms rent asunder, by heresies distressed'? Sometimes the sense is obscure or difficult to grasp without much study, or quite beyond the comprehension of congregations, as in the lines:

'Many a blow and biting sculpture
Polished well those stones elect,
In their places now compacted
By the heavenly Architect,' etc.

Some hymns are dull, and contain neither devotional warmth nor poetic fire to rouse the soul. Although the hymns in our bulky modern collections are intended for use in the Church services by all classes of men, many of them are not congregational—being not hymns at all, but rather poems, and fitter to be read at home than sung by a multitude in church. Many contain words or figures that are too difficult for the humbler classes to understand. Surely such words and phrases as 'panoply,' 'guerdon,' 'Trisagion,' 'transcendent,' 'transitory,' 'potentate,' 'constellations,' 'refulgent,' 'beatific,' 'ineffably sublime,' 'celestial resplendence,' are beyond the comprehension of many people, and ought to be removed from hymn-books. The number of people in a congregation who know the meaning of 'panoply' must be very small. If 'the armour of your God' were substituted for 'the panoply of God,' in the hymn 'Soldiers of Christ,' the sense would be simplified, and the verse sing as well as before. If congregations are to 'sing praises with understanding,' figurative language should be used with caution, and reference to things not generally known avoided. Probably few people see the reference to the 'broken cistern' in the hymn, 'Begone, unbelief,' and to the 'golden bells' of the high-priest's ephod in the hymn, 'Thou art coming.' It was the opinion of Luther that the words of hymns should be 'all according to the

* It may have been once, and, let us hope, will be again. But no one who considers the divisions which have sprung up among us, and the strange doctrines, will say it is true now. This, however, is not the fault of the writer of the hymn.

capacity of the common people, quite simple and vulgar, and come out in a clear and telling way, and that the meaning should be given full, plainly, and according to the spirit of the psalm.' Besides being clear and simple, hymns intended for use in the services of the Church should be devotional. Didactic and descriptive poems are not properly hymns. The best hymns are those of prayer and adoration, and of praise and thanksgiving—those of praise and thanksgiving being the best of all for use in public worship.

It is remarkable that mournful and sentimental hymns are more often used, in many churches, than those written in a cheerful vein. The inspired psalms are always joyful; 'the voice of joy and health' is heard in them all; the thought of praise and thanksgiving is always present, and often appears on the surface. Even those which begin with prayer and supplication generally end with praise and thanksgiving. Whilst many modern hymn-writers are full of gloomy sentiment, the Sweet Psalmist of Israel overflows with joyful feeling. In his own words: 'The Lord is my strength and my shield; my heart hath trusted in Him, and I am helped; therefore my heart danceth for joy, and in my song will I praise Him.' Even when he is at his lowest, and his sin is ever before him, he looks forward to the time when God, of His mercy, will forgive him and strengthen him with His Holy Spirit; and he, delivered from blood-guiltiness, shall sing of God's righteousness. 'Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord; and my mouth shall shew Thy praise.' To us the Psalmist again and again addresses exhortations to praise God in cheerful song. Singing everywhere in the sacred writers belongs to the expression of joy and gladness, and, by a figure, even inanimate things are represented as breaking forth into joy and singing. (See especially the beautiful passages in Isaiah xxxv. 1, 2, 6, 10; xliv. 23; li. 3, 11; lii. 8, 9; lv. 12.) At the laying of the earth's foundations 'the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.' And St. John learned that, when time shall be no more, one of the occupations of the redeemed shall be singing hymns of praise. Sacred music in Bible times seems to have been

invariably of the healthy, cheerful kind. 'And David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren to be the singers . . . lifting up the voice with joy' (1 Chron. xv. 16). Jehoiada restored the worship of God, and caused the burnt offering to be accompanied 'with rejoicing and with singing, as it was ordained by David' (2 Chron. xxiii. 18). 'Hezekiah the king and the princes commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the words of David, and of Asaph the seer. And they sang praises with gladness, and they bowed their heads and worshipped' (2 Chron. xxix. 30). 'They sang together by course in praise and giving thanks unto the Lord' (Ezra iii. 11). 'For in the days of David and Asaph of old there were chief of the singers, and songs of praise and thanksgiving unto God' (Neh. xii. 46). Such, then, was psalmody in Bible times. Church music was cheerful and elevating. The only place—so far as the present writer is aware—in which mention is made of singing mournful songs (though not in the Temple service) is in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, where we learn that lamentations or funeral dirges for Josiah were chanted in memory of that king. When they are in distress, God's people hang up their harps. They cannot sing a song and melody in their heaviness. They cannot sing the Lord's song in a strange land. By the waters of Babylon they sit down and weep; and the songs of Zion are not heard there. In the New Testament, as in the Old, singing is the vehicle of joy and gladness, and not of mournfulness and gloom. 'Is there any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms.' We are told of St. Paul and Silas in the prison, that they prayed and sang praises. It has been remarked that many modern hymns are full of gloomy sentiment. Even the last sufferings of the Man of Sorrows are held to be a fit subject for song. Hymns have been written on the Passion, which are truly dreadful. The hymn, 'O, come and mourn,' for example, contains passages which are so harrowing to the feelings that one wonders what manner of man he would be who could sing the hymn through. In the beautiful and justly admired hymn, 'When I survey the wondrous cross,' the details are omitted,

or at least are not put vividly before the singer. It is strange that many people prefer mournful hymns to those of a more cheerful kind. The present writer confesses that he cannot see what useful purpose gloomy hymns can serve. It seems to him that the hymns used in Divine service ought almost always to be those of praise and thanksgiving. There is something stirring in a hymn like 'Lord of the worlds above,' especially when it is sung to 'Darwell's' tune—old 'Darwell's,' without the diluted harmonies put to it by some modern arrangers. And it is hard to believe that anyone could take part in singing such a hymn as this, and not be the better for it.*

A serious fault in some hymns is their great length. It would be well if clergymen, instead of choosing lengthy hymns, to be hurried through at an indecent pace, chose shorter hymns and insisted on their being sung slowly and reverently. The writer once heard the fine hymn, 'Hail to the Lord's Anointed,' ruined by an organist and choir who, having frequently to undertake long hymns, had got the habit of racing through every hymn. On the occasion referred to the painful effect was increased by the disposition of the boys to hurry the pace still more, and the evident struggles of the organist to keep up with them.

Besides the faults above enumerated, there are others. Hymns containing mixed metaphors, bad grammar, false rhymes, and bald versification, are all to be found in our collections. It seems to be more difficult to write a good hymn than a poem. While it is neither necessary nor desirable that hymns should be written in a style that would satisfy poets and literary men, it is not too much to require that they should be excellent in their way.

The mechanical part of the hymn-writer's work is not

* A writer to the *Echo* lately gave a story Paxton Hood used to tell: He went as a supply to some country place, where the senior deacon chose and gave out the hymns. The worthy brother commenced the service by giving out the hymn, "My thoughts on awful subjects roll." Paxton started up, and said, "No, no! My thoughts don't roll on such subjects at all. Let us sing 'Come let us join our cheerful songs, with angels round the throne,'"—thus gently rebuking the lovers of doleful psalmody.'

always well done, and the result is there are hymns that read well, but will not sing. For this there are two reasons. In hymns a line of the poetry is sung to a strain of the music—generally marked by a double bar. At the end of every strain (or every second strain) is a point of repose; and in constructing the verse it is necessary to bear this in mind, and contrive that there shall be a stop (if only a comma), at the end of every line (or every second line). When this rule is neglected, the hymn, be it ever so excellent, loses somewhat when sung. But when a line contains a whole clause and a portion of another, not completed, but carried over to the next line, that which may be excellent when read, often becomes absolute nonsense when sung. 'Jesus lives! no longer now can thy terrors, Death, appal us,' becomes, 'Jesus lives no longer now.—Can thy terrors, Death, appal us?'—which is so horrible that one can only wonder that this hymn is ever used. Other examples of this stultification of the sense occur in the same hymn and some others. It may be enough to point out the first line of hymn 106, and the sixth verse of hymn 17, in Hymns Ancient and Modern. Sometimes the last note of the strain is shortened when such a difficulty arises; but this practice (objectionable on musical grounds) does not entirely destroy the bad effect. Equally ineffectual are the attempts of organists to remove the difficulty by connecting and detaching the strains by means of the *legato* and *staccato* touches. There is another reason why some hymns read well, but will not sing. In a hymn one tune (the accents of which are fixed once for all) has to serve for all the verses. If the accents of the poetry do not fall in the same places in every verse, they will sometimes clash with the musical accents, and syllables will be wrongly accented. For example, 'Mor-*tals* give thanks and sing,' 'Har-*ping* on harps of gold,' 'O-*ver* some foul dark spot,' 'Well-*ing* from out the throne,' 'Nor *to* man's heart hath come,' 'Hark *the* glad sound.' Hymn 138 in the 'Hymnal Companion,' 'Just as I am,' does not sing well. If it is sung to a tune of which the first and third strains are symmetrical, the accents fall in the right places in the first, third, sixth, and seventh verses only; if it

is sung to the tune in the book, there occur in these verses, 'And *that* thou bidd'st me come,' 'Figh-*tings* and fears,' 'Now *to* be thine,' 'Here *for* a season, then above.' Sometimes hymns which would sing well are stultified in the performance by being sung to tunes which do not suit the rhythm. This, of course, is not the fault of the poet. If the hymn, 'Blow ye the trumpet, blow,' is sung to 'Darwell's' tune, there appear in every stanza the ludicrous words, 'The year of Ju—Billie is come' (for 'The year of Jubilee is come'). Substitute Mr. Ross's tune, 'St. Peter's, Manchester,' for 'Darwell's,' and the hymn sings well.* An obstacle in the way of an absolutely perfect rendering of hymns is the retaining of one and the same tune throughout the hymn while the sentiment perhaps varies in every stanza. In Mercer's book there was a hymn in which the tune changed from major to minor, and back again, to suit the sentiment. Some, not satisfied with a change of mode, have even proposed to have a different tune for each stanza, thus creating a new musical form, which may be called a hymn-anthem. But these ways of dealing with the subject, while they remove the difficulty, are neither advisable nor feasible. A book of hymn-anthems would be huge and expensive, and the changes of mode and tune would confuse congregations. An absolutely perfect rendering of the psalmody can never be expected of congregations, nor is it necessary.

There appears to be a disposition now to discard hymns of the old school. But old favourites should certainly be retained when they are respectable. We heard them when we were young; they call up old associations; they have done good service many a year; and they deserve every consideration at our hands. It would have been well if the compilers had retained more of them, and set their faces against the poor, sentimental modern hymns, with their jingling rhymes and sublime doggerel, which are found in our voluminous collections.

* When the so-called fugal tune was used, such ludicrous divisions as the following sometimes occurred: 'I love to steal—awhile away,' 'And take thy pil—grim home,' 'And love thee bet—ter than before.'

It is remarkable that many of our best hymns are the composition of Nonconformists of the eighteenth century. It is pleasing to find these excellent hymns in use in the Church of England, as it shows that while our Nonconformist brethren differ from us on certain points, there exists a bond of union between us. At the same time, compilers should be careful lest, carried too far by the wish to be 'catholic,' they admit any hymns that come from a questionable source and contain unsound doctrine.

Metrical psalms, once the delight of congregations, are now generally discarded, though a few appear in our modern collections as hymns. More might have been retained with advantage. It is objected that as a versifier cannot always make good verse and preserve the exact sense of the original, the Psalms lost much by being done into metre. And this is true. But the defect is not peculiar to metrical psalms. There are hymns which contain quotations from the Bible, tortured to meet the exigencies of the verse; and the difference between the simple and affecting language of Scripture and the phraseology of our modern rhymesters is very marked. Metrical Litanies have appeared in our hymn-books, though it is hard to believe that a Church already possessing a beautiful and perfect Litany in her Prayer-book could want them. A singular modern fashion remains to be noticed—the closing of every hymn with an 'Amen,' whether the sense requires it or not.

But if our hymns are not always satisfactory, neither are the tunes. We have retained some of the excellent tunes of past times, and new tunes of merit are sometimes written; but many tunes that are not altogether satisfactory appear in our hymn-books. Of these some are written in imitation of the Lutheran tunes, the spirit of which, however, they lack. Others are too mixed in style—the writers tried to combine too many different qualities in them, and their tunes express nothing in particular. Far more unsatisfactory, because quite wanting in the decorous grandeur and beauty that should distinguish Church music, are tunes written in the new style. Such tunes are part-song-like in character; languishing, sen-

timental, sensuous, and exciting; whining, and full of maudlin melancholy and lugubrious wailing; lively and jigging; or dull and stupid. Difficulty, the frequent introduction of the chromatic element, ugly or unmeaning melody, feeble or incorrect harmony, and want of symmetry, are faults all found in hymn-tunes. There are even tunes which are evidently the work of composers whose musical education is very imperfect; and from time to time tunes are produced by 'composers' who can have had no musical education at all—tunes which are about as excellent as the effusions of a village poet, to whose 'verses' they might very appropriately furnish the music. The writer possesses a collection which contains a tune in which consecutive fifths and octaves occur, and B naturals are written for C flats—indeed, the tune is full of glaring violations of musical grammar.

The practice of adapting melodies and making hymn-tunes of them is not free from objection both from the artistic and devotional point of view. It was not unknown to our ancestors, who adapted tunes from Haydn's symphonies and 'Creation' ('With verdure clad,' and 'The heavens are telling'), Handel's oratorios ('I know that my Redeemer,' 'What tho' I trace,' 'Lord, remember David,' etc.), and even from profane sources, as minuets, glees, song-tunes ('Drink to me only with thine eyes,' etc.), Mozart's operas ('Ah, perdona,' etc.), Gluck's operas (March in 'Alceste,' Chorus of Priestesses in 'Iphigenie en Tauride'), Weber's 'Freischütz' ('Softly sighs'). One favourite tune, which has received an extraordinary amount of abuse at the hands of musicians, but is still used in Advent, is said to have been adapted from a hornpipe, though, if so, it has quite lost its original character. It is curious to note that while these old adapted tunes are, happily, no longer used, we have modern adaptations from Mozart's 'Twelfth Mass,' Spohr's oratorios, Mendelssohn's 'Songs without Words,' Beethoven's sonatas, and even a tune strongly reminding the hearer of the 'Vicar of Bray.' It is generally allowed that tunes from profane sources cannot, with propriety, be used in church if the sources are known; but that when the sources are certainly unknown to the con-

gregation, such tunes may be used. The writer once heard the hymn, 'From Greenland's icy mountains,' sung to an excellent tune, which he would never have supposed to be an adaptation from an Italian nautical ballad. The melodies of some of our grandest old tunes were adapted from popular German songs (secular as well as sacred), though such a source would never be suspected.

In good tunes the bad qualities mentioned in speaking of inferior tunes are wanting; and there are found solidity, grandeur, beauty, animation, simplicity, originality, purity of style, good melody, harmony, modulation, and rhythm. Good tunes, moreover, are 'vocal.' All the parts are melodious. Chords of only two or three notes are few, and the harmony is complete in each chord. Pure four-part vocal harmony is used, and filling-up notes for the organ are not required.

Good tunes are numerous. Not to speak of the compositions of living and recent writers of excellence, who have produced bold, hearty, and elegant tunes, there are the grand old tunes, the work sometimes of the Reformers (Lutheran or Calvinistic), sometimes of later writers (English or foreign) in imitation of them; and the flowing, melodious tunes of a much later period. To the first (or grand) class belong the German *choräle*, well-known examples of which are 'Wachet auf,' 'Ein feste Burg,' 'Wer nur den lieben Gott lässt walten,' 'Nun freut euch' ('Luther's Hymn'), 'O Gott, der du mein Vater bist' (the old 112th Psalm, by Luther), 'Nun danket alle Gott'; the Genevan (Calvinistic) tunes, examples of which are the melody of the 124th Psalm (sometimes called 'Basle,' and perhaps the composition of Goudimel) and the melody of the 'Old Hundredth'; tunes found in the old Scotch psalters, as 'Dundee,' or 'French,' 'Windsor,' and in Ravenscroft and other English psalters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as the 'Old 104th' and 'Old 81st' psalm-tunes, 'St. David's,' 'St. Michael's,' 'St. Mary's'; and some tunes by later composers, as Croft's 'St. Ann's' tune and 'Hanover.' The Doric tunes, of which 'Martyr's,' 'Plaintive "Martyr's" worthy of the name,' mentioned by Burns in his 'Cotter's Saturday Night,' and found in the old Scotch psalters, is a

specimen, also belong to this class. Tunes of the first class are generally in common time, and have one note to each syllable. The effect of them when sung slowly by a large congregation is truly sublime. To the second (or melodious) class of good old tunes belong such tunes as 'Wareham,' 'Wiltshire,' 'Rockingham,' and 'Manchester New.' Tunes of this class are generally in triple time. Some of them are a little florid, and some have, in a degree, the character of the grand tune. Melodious tunes cannot be ranked with the majestic tunes of the first class; but they will ever have a charm for the lovers of melody. But there are old tunes which cannot be placed in either of these classes—the florid tune and the Gregorian tune.

Florid tunes delight in elaborate melody, with quavers and dotted crotchets, graces, syncopations, and other embellishments, scale passages, and sequential treatment. In some of them changes of time are found. There are two kinds of florid tune: the (so-called) fugal tune, in which some of the parts rest occasionally; and the more sedate tune, in which the melody is florid but the harmony is full throughout. The fugal tune is sometimes expanded almost into a little anthem. The fugal, or imitative, style appears in the middle of the tune, which ends with the repetition of the words of the last line to a vigorous strain in which all the parts join. For convenience, tunes that have *piano* passages for one, two, or three voices, or for two voices in thirds or sixths, with a bass for the organ, in place of the fugal element, may be classed with the fugal tune. Our compilers have happily discarded the fugal tune, though they might perhaps have retained 'Arabia,' 'Trinity,' 'Cedar,' 'Spilsby,' 'Justification,' 'Calcutta' (omitting the middle portion of the tune and the semiquavers in the second strain), and a few others. Such tunes might be useful on particular occasions. Certainly many florid tunes of the more sedate kind might be used if the redundant strain, which necessitates the repetition of a line, were cut out, though the alteration could not be made in 'Milton,' 'Lydia,' and a few others. In many of them the excision would be unnecessary, *e.g.*, 'Sheldon' or 'New York,'

'Mount Ephraim,' 'Gainsborough,' 'Maidstone' (J. Scott), the first four strains of 'Boston,' 'Warwick,' 'Stafford,' 'Stockport' or 'New Sabbath,' and 'Stonefield' (Stanley). The quavers and dotted crotchets in these tunes might generally be allowed to remain. These tunes are in four-part harmony throughout; and the only places where alteration seems to be required are the third strain in 'Sheldon' and the penultimate bar in 'Stockport.' There are, perhaps, a few other places where some would consider a slight simplification of the melody to be called for. Such tunes might have been classed with the melodious tune; indeed, they are both melodious and florid. The writer would not wish to be misunderstood to estimate the florid tune as highly as the melodious tune, or as the grand tune with one note to each syllable. He simply contends that the florid tunes are often melodious in a high degree, and that their cheerful, tuneful notes are preferable to the poor, whining, sensuous strains now enjoying a certain kind of popularity. In truth, many of the plainer kind of florid tunes in which the harmony is full throughout, if taken at a proper pace and correctly accompanied, are by no means so objectionable as it is fashionable to pronounce them. Nay, many of them are so stirring, and many have something so noble in them, that it must be extreme fastidiousness that rejects them. They might, indeed, easily be spoiled in performance; if sung at the great pace approved by the church choir-boy, and accompanied with a feeble, pianoforte-like accompaniment, they would be offensive enough. The eminent London organist, Dr. E. H. Turpin, writes: 'There was at least one merit in the old tunes and their performers of two generations or more ago: the tunes were comparatively sedate, despite their flimsy ornamentations and executive eccentricities; such tunes were not intended to be, and indeed were not, "reeled off" with bouncing, assertive accents, at a "quick march" pace, in the manner so many more recent tunes are indecently yelled by the overwhelming troops of obstreperous choir-boys to be found in most churches in our time.' (*Organ World*, June 15, 1889.) Among the composers of tunes more or less florid are found the names of Thomas

Adams, Stanley, Jeremiah Clark, Dr. Randal, Dr. Arnold, Dr. Hayes, Dr. Worgan, and Dr. Boyce.

The very opposite to the florid tune, with its exuberant melody, is the Gregorian tune, which, interesting from the musical historian's point of view, is unfit for congregational use, as it possesses no melody at all.*

As in everything else, there have been changes in hymn-tunes. The influence of Bach, who frequently took the Lutheran psalm-tunes as the *canti fermi* on which to construct his beautiful compositions, was considerable. This great man added passing-notes to many of the *choräle*, whereby the ruggedness of the old tunes was lessened, while their dignity remained unimpaired. The principal melody, always found in the tenor till not a century and a half ago, now is always in the treble. Florid counterpoint is no longer used in hymn-tunes. In 1627 Claude le Jeune harmonized the Psalms in simple counterpoint. But as early as 1585 Cosyns, in England, had published sixty tunes in plain counterpoint. Psalm-tunes in the style of motets are not written now. A modern hymn-tune little resembles a psalm-tune of the time of Johann Walther. Harmony in many parts has been discarded by composers and arrangers of hymn-tunes, and that in four parts is always preferred. In Este's Psalter of 1594 the harmony is in four parts, as it is also in Ravenscroft. Such alterations simplified psalmody without destroying its high quality; and as they made it fitter for congregational use, must indeed be improvements. But some *recent* alterations are not so warrantable. Modern harmonies have been added to old tunes by men who do not seem to have grasped

* This statement was not allowed to pass unchallenged by some admirers of Gregorian music. These gentlemen maintain that Gregorian or Latin hymn-tunes *are* melodious. The writer did not intend to say that such tunes were *absolutely* devoid of melody (even a number of notes written down at random, without regard to their rhythmical value or position on the stave, contain some kind of melody, and it might be possible to sing them to an English hymn). But when the best of the Gregorian tunes are compared with such tunes as 'Hanover' or 'Wiltshire,' their want of melody—as musicians understand the term—and unfitness for congregational use are at once apparent.

the spirit of these dignified old melodies. Dr. Turpin remarks: 'We note the modernization and chromatic enrichment of harmony, and of late there has been, in fit keeping with the spread of much verbal sentimentality, a tendency to make hymn-tunes as sugary and part-song-like as possible.' In some modern collections we find musical editors re-arranging (and spoiling) old tunes. A fine old tune when modernized and clothed in weak, inappropriate harmony, loses its character, as a noble and venerable-looking man would appear very strange if he were attired in the dress and jewels of a fop. The Doric tunes especially have suffered, having in almost every case been altered in order to render them easier to harmonize. By being translated into modern tonality these melodies have lost their Doric flavour. But the grand old tunes have not only been tampered with and set to inappropriate harmonies, they are frequently spoiled in performance by being taken at far too great a pace. Some of the melodious tunes also have been altered, without always improving them. The removal of the passing-note in the last bar but one of 'Rockingham,' for instance, is no improvement.

Many of the grand old tunes, the writer believes, are generally unknown in England. While our hymn-books are more than sufficiently voluminous, they contain comparatively few tunes of the grand class. We have, indeed, borrowed *some* of the German *choräle*, but we should have borrowed many more. The *choräle* are the perfection of psalm-tunes, being at once simple, devotional, and elevated in character. It is truly humiliating to compare our modern hymn-books with the collections used in German churches. The Würtemberg tune-book contains upwards of two hundred tunes, of which every one is satisfactory, while most are absolutely perfect specimens of psalm-tunes. Some of the tunes are sublime in style, some are beautiful, and in some the sublime and beautiful styles are mixed. If English compilers had omitted the many feeble melodies with their sensuous, 'sugary and part-song-like harmonies' that appear in their collections, and given us a few more of the *choräle* in their place, they would indeed have done something to improve our psalmody. But

the popular demand is ever for something new, and they probably felt themselves compelled to humour the public.

But if tunes of the grand class are not used in our churches as freely as they might be, those of the melodious class are less frequently heard than they once were. Many of these flowing, melodious tunes have been laid aside, and some are passing away. Among those omitted by compilers may be mentioned: 'Bristol' (S. Wesley),* 'Belgrave,' 'Salzburg' (a tune of ten strains), 'Lee' (nine strains), 'St. Olave's,' 'Aldermary,' 'Doncaster' or 'Galway,' 'Liverpool,' 'Irish,' 'Battersea,' 'New Chapel,' 'Asylum,' 'Desire,' 'Lancaster' or 'Langshaw,' 'Oswestry,' 'Warrington,' 'Windle,' 'Hotham' ('Jesu, refuge of my soul'), 'Oxford,' 'Richmond,' 'Haweis,' 'St. Saviour,' 'Widdop,' 'St. Paul's,' 'Bath Chapel,' 'St. Augustine,' 'St. Crux' (Scarisbrick), 'St. Mark,' 'St. Gregory,' 'Brunswick,' 'Lewes' ('Guide us, O Thou great Jehovah'). Few of these tunes need altering. The second strain in 'Battersea' and the second bar in 'New Chapel' might be simplified; the quavers in 'St. Paul's' and 'Bath Chapel,' and those in the second strain of 'Oswestry,' might be omitted, as also the quavers and syncopations in 'Oxford'; and the redundant strains in 'Hotham' might be left out. The little floridity that remains after these alterations are made is not objectionable. While the tendency at present is to banish such smooth, flowing melodies as these from church, they are retained, the writer believes, by the Nonconformists, at whose chapels the best congregational singing is always heard. We are flooded with new-fashioned tunes with pretty, feeble, catching melodies and 'sugary' harmonies; and these, not because they are better than the old tunes (they are not worthy to be compared with them), but because they are written in a style that pleases the public, are becoming popular. The sea of sentimentality has swept away the

* He was the son of Charles Wesley, the hymn-writer, and father of the late Dr. Wesley, the famous organist of Gloucester Cathedral. He was one of the first in England to appreciate Bach's works, and wrote a number of excellent voluntaries for the organ, which have lately been adapted to organs of modern compass.

cheerful florid tune, and it now threatens the melodious tune; it has shaken the foundations of the grand tune, and perhaps may some day swallow it up altogether.

The present writer, while venturing to advocate the more frequent use of the old tunes, does not make age the sole test of excellence; if it were, then Gregorian melodies would be the best of all hymn-tunes, and Gauntlett, Wesley, Elvey, Turle, and other excellent composers of our own time, would be no composers at all. It would surely be absurd to say that the old tunes are always good music, and the new tunes always bad. But it may be safely affirmed that many of the old favourites that have been, or apparently are about to be, discarded, are vastly better compositions than many of the recent tunes which have supplanted them. Probably all who are not content to blindly follow fashion and have no mind of their own, will concede that all the old tunes that have been mentioned above, and many more, ought to have been retained. While heartily advocating the introduction of more of the grand and stately German tunes, and the revival of many of the melodious tunes, the writer does not recommend the hasty, indiscriminating revival of the florid tunes, or of those tunes of the melodious class in which the florid element largely appears. He simply pleads for such of the old tunes as neither violate the laws of musical taste nor offend decorum. In short, he ventures to protest against the present fashion, which is to judge too harshly and condemn too summarily those good old tunes our fathers liked so well.

The excellence of hymn-tunes is sometimes judged by the measure of popularity that is accorded them—a delusive test indeed, since some of the poorest tunes, by being often used, have become or are becoming popular, and the public taste is not very high. The very qualities in a tune which cause it to become a favourite with people wanting in perception and musical feeling are often such as render it unfit for use in church. That it has achieved a cheap popularity cannot be held to justify the use of a poor tune. The standard of Church music should not be lowered to please unmusical people. To listen to poor music is trying to people of culture; and if such

persons are often in the minority, their feelings should be respected. The use of any other than good music in church cannot be too strongly condemned. And by good Church music the present writer understands such as is artistically written, is suited to the expression of the words, is decorous and Church-like in character (and therefore in harmony with the place and purpose of public worship), and is thoroughly adapted for congregational singing. Such music is devotional, yet stirring, and, though the composition of artists, is so simple that it may be enjoyed by the humblest person in the congregation.*

We speak of our 'bright services' and sing at a great (nay, often a frantic) pace; but *our psalmody is not cheerful.* Nor will it be until we cast out the weak, 'sugary' tunes, and use more of the good old tunes, as they are rightly called, until we discard our sentimental new acquaintance and return to our hearty old friends.

* 'Church music, to answer fully its purpose, must be the expression of fervent devotion. It must be subservient to the worship. It must be intelligible to the congregation collectively. It must be beautiful, and especially melodious. It must be quite in accordance with the words to which it is wedded, and must allow a proper accentuation of the words. It must be original, and not in any way arranged or mutilated.'—Carl Engel, 'Reflections on Church Music,' p. 106.

CHAPTER II.

CHORAL AND CONGREGATIONAL SERVICES.

ON the subject of Church services there are great differences of opinion. Some men like a plain service, and hold that it matters not what the quality of Church music be, provided that the singing be hearty; others think the services should be plain and hearty, but are of opinion that only sound, good music should be used; some like what they call a 'semi-choral service,' while others prefer one 'fully choral'; and some extremely enthusiastic musicians would have choral services in which congregations should not join audibly, but worship in silence by listening to the clergy and choristers as they render the prayers and praises of the Church. Some clergymen look with a little mistrust on Church musicians, while those of another school freely admit a very considerable quantity of music into their churches. The present writer is not so presumptuous as to suppose that he can 'decide when doctors disagree,' and he has no wish to dogmatize when discussing a matter about which men may and will think differently. He, however, ventures to think that, while all the music used in church should be high in quality, it should nevertheless be such as the people can understand and take part in; that Church services should be simple and congregational, rather than elaborate and choral; and that what we want at present in many churches is not a musical service, but better preaching and more expressive reading by the clergy, and better singing and more hearty responding on the part of the people.*

* The use of a high-class yet simple psalmody has already been advocated, and it has been attempted to show the fallacy and pernicious-

It may be well first to notice arguments which those musical enthusiasts who would allow only officiating ministers, choristers, and organists to take part audibly in public worship, bring forward in support of their views, and then to consider arguments for and against the choral service. The advocates for a silent congregation observe with regret that the perfected artistic efforts of organists and choirs are thrown away at churches where the congregation sing. They tell us that at the Temple at Jerusalem the music was rendered by a band and chorus, and the people took no part therein. From which they argue that our modern congregations need not—nay, perhaps, ought not—to join in the singing. But the Jewish system, with its sacrifices and ceremonies, having passed away, modern divines are not bound to use the ritual of the Temple service; and Christians neither believe it to be necessary to have choral services at their churches because they were celebrated at the Temple, nor consider it desirable that modern Church musicians should work on Jewish lines. Indeed, it is not a little absurd to consider the Temple music, and the particular manner in which it was performed, as examples for our imitation. If we were really required to use the venerable Jewish form of worship at our parish churches, we should, with better reason and more humility, copy that of the synagogue rather than the statelier services of the Temple. Doubtless, any more delicate effects the organist may have contemplated are hardly noticed, or perhaps quite destroyed, when the congregation sing heartily. But this weighs little when compared with the advantages gained from congregational singing—not to say with its impressive effects, when good in quality. Those who oppose congregational singing are doubtless led to do so by their intense love of music. Themselves powerfully affected when they hear grand music, and contented to listen without taking part in it, they forget that the same is not the case with everyone else. While none will condemn these lovers of a beautiful art for their cultivated taste, few moderate

ness of that belief according to which psalmody of a low, popular type is the best for congregational singing (Chapter I.).

men probably will agree with their notions of what good *Church* music is. With these enthusiasts music is not so much a handmaid to devotion, to be kept in her proper place and in due subjection, as an object of worship itself. It is, at least with some of them, an idol, which they would set up in the sanctuary, and have all men to worship. Their selfishness is great who would prevent worshippers from taking part in the service. And as they may hear the choral service at cathedrals and enjoy grand sacred music at the oratorio concerts and musical festivals, which are now become so common, their interference with the services of parish churches is altogether without excuse. These enthusiasts quite mistake the purpose of Church music,* and would, if they had their way, turn churches into something very like consecrated concert-halls, where the people might hear good music without charge. 'It is an evil day for a parish,' remarked an eminent divine, 'when their voices prevail in the Church council.' The following extract from an American paper shows what may happen when musical enthusiasts are allowed to have too much of their own way: 'The musical programmes in the various [New York] churches [on Easter Day] were elaborate. In some cases the services were almost entirely musical, the pulpit only coming in here and there to fill up the chinks and crannies. The standard English composers are chiefly represented in the programmes [!], our American writers being far in the minority.' The other day an English Church paper gave an account of a church opening at which morning prayer was rendered with orchestral accompaniment (!).

But reasons are brought forward to justify the introduction of the choral service by people who are not organists, choristers, and musical enthusiasts. It is maintained that people like it, that it is heartier and brighter than the plain, congregational service, that it draws good congregations, and that it is a help to devotion. Further, monotoning and intoning are said to

* 'The purpose of Church music is to promote the glorification of God and the edification of man. Church music is, consequently, for all people.'—Carl Engel, 'Reflections on Church Music.'

be more solemn and Church-like than reading, and a help to clergymen that are not good readers. It may be conceded that monotoning and intoning are helpful to clergymen that are too cold to read with feeling and expression, or whose voices are too weak to fill a very large church. But in churches of other than the largest size they cannot often be required to help the voice. When they are attempted by clergymen that are not musical (which is sometimes the case), they are distressing to hear, the monotone rather resembling a noise compounded of the reading of national school children, the beating of an organ-pipe when being tuned, and the sound of distant machinery, than the voice of a minister of the Gospel offering up prayer. That the prayers of the Church are more solemn and Church-like when rendered in this ugly, sing-song style, than when they are read (or, rather, *prayed*) with feeling and in the natural voice, is not true. The writer has heard services that were very solemn and Church-like, and yet not a note of the *quasi*-recitative called intoning or monotoning was used. That a choral service will draw a congregation is a consideration of importance only to those who cannot draw the people by other means. That it is brighter and heartier than a plain congregational service may be disputed. Many years ago the writer heard a bright and hearty service at a Nonconformist chapel in the North of England. He does not remember whether there were responses for the people at this service; but he has not forgotten the splendid manner in which the congregation took up and sang some inspiriting hymns. The stirring psalmody, the fervent prayer, the expressive reading, and grand preaching of Mr. —— filled the chapel. This gifted man drew a congregation without the help of a choral service. And if he could do it, why should a clergyman of the Church of England, with a beautiful Liturgy in his hands—a Liturgy of which many portions are the composition of the wisest and most pious men of olden time, and many are taken from Holy Scripture itself; a Liturgy for which candid and intelligent Dissenters have expressed admiration—why should a clergyman, with this admirable book in his hand, require the aid of

an *excess* of music to fill his church and render his services bright and hearty! It is probably true that many people who are fond of singing like choral services, and to take part in them. It is also true that there are very many musical people who prefer plain services: the chapels of the Dissenters have plain services—they have little music (though what they have is hearty), and yet are well filled. It seems doubtful whether people who prefer choral services because they like to sing, can manage their voices and also keep their minds on the petitions they are singing. May they not sometimes forget the meaning of the words in attending to the tune? Is it not possible that—without being intentionally irreverent—they may sometimes forget the worship in the singing? It would probably be hard to prove that they like choral services, who go to church *solely* from the high motive of joining intelligently and heartily in public worship, and not to be entertained, to some extent at least, by listening to, or taking part in, a performance of music. It is claimed for the choral service that it is a help to devotion. That the chanting of canticles and Psalms, and the singing of hymns, in which all can join, is helpful, there can be no doubt. But it is hard to see how a musical rendering of creeds, litanies, Amens, Kyries, and the responses generally, can be helpful in this way. These parts of the service are already perfectly devotional, and need not the help of music. Being already perfect from the devotional point of view, it seems as if they could gain only in *musical* effect when rendered musically. The use of music in such parts of the service may gratify the sense of hearing, but it cannot make the petitions uttered more devotional in effect, or in fact. Elaborate choral music may be a pleasing thing in itself, but intruding where it is not required, it may (so far from being a help to devotion) be a hindrance, and even tend to make men forget the true object of worship. That choral services delight the sense of hearing in careless people seems very probable; but there is no good reason to suppose that listening to them makes such people devout. They please rather than edify. Though more agreeable to the hearers, a vicarious service by a few experts seems

scarcely more expressive of congregational devotion than that manner of rendering Divine service which has been called the 'parson and clerk duet.' As for the superior solemnity of the choral service, it does not exist, except when all the conditions are favourable. Choral services, to be solemn, must he heard in cathedrals, where everything is in harmony with them: the vast size and venerable age of the buildings —the great number of clergy and choristers—the reverberation —the 'dim religious light.' In parish churches they almost always seem out of place. Admitted that the choral service is delightful and solemn in effect when heard in perfection in its native home, the cathedral, it may be asked, Is solemnity wanting in the plain, well-rendered parish church service? The plain service in which the clergyman reads and the people respond in the natural voice, and the singing is hearty and congregational, may not be so grand and imposing as the cathedral service as heard in some venerable minster, but it may be as expressive. It may not have as fine an effect, perhaps, but this will not be a matter of concern to the earnest worshipper. Though wanting in everything like magnificence, the simple service of a little country church, to a devout person, who feels that the Divine Presence is near, may be as precious as the grandest and most costly service that human skill and art could contrive. Surely a service which the people understand and take part in does not yield in brightness, heartiness, and devotion to another in which the singing and responding are done by a few persons specially trained for the purpose.

The powers of music are probably over-estimated by those who use it so freely in the Church services. Still, they are undoubtedly great, and if employed with moderation in public worship may be very helpful. There can be no doubt that the canticles, psalms, and hymns gain much by being musically rendered; and in these portions of the service music seems highly appropriate. The singing of a *Te Deum* or a grand hymn by a congregation is at once impressive and expressive of devotion, and to take part therein leads the soul upwards. A daily paper in a recent article on Church music says that

hearing good music 'elevates and purifies the mind, and attunes it to religious and spiritual contemplation.' All who know the power of music will concede that there is music which is capable of producing these effects, though, alas! they are probably only transient. One of the most extraordinary instances of the power of music on record is met with in the history of Saul, whose dark malady often yielded for a time to the music of David's harp. But if music could sometimes refresh Saul, it seems sometimes to have operated injuriously on the already troubled mind of that unhappy monarch, and driven him absolutely mad. The history of Saul teaches that music alone can do little for man; and they greatly err who ascribe divine powers to music, and believe it can transform the heart. If the elevation and purification of the mind, and the contemplative mood induced by hearing good music were thorough and lasting, and superior to the effects produced by taking part, with heart and voice, in the public services of the sanctuary, we could hardly have too much choral music in our churches. The whole of the morning and evening services might properly be made to resemble an oratorio, with choruses for the choir connected by recitative for the clergyman; and the Communion Service might be rendered to the music of Palestrina and the Roman school, or that of Bach, Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven by artists engaged for the purpose. But however delightful a thing music may be, and however excellent its effects on hearers, it is inconceivable that listening to a rendering of the Church service by a few chosen persons can produce such excellent and spiritual effects, or be so effectual a means of addressing the Deity, as taking one's own part in the singing and responses. Whatever powers may justly be ascribed to music, the singing of a large congregation is more inspiriting and altogether more effective than the best efforts of a handful of trained singers. There can be no Church music more effective, and more affecting, than the singing of the 'Old Hundredth' psalm in unison by a great number of people. The great Augustine was greatly moved by the singing in the church at Milan, which was *unisonous and congregational.* He had this music in his mind when

he said: 'Oh, how much I wept, how exceedingly moved and affected I was, at the hymns, songs, and harmonious voices of the Church! Those voices pierced my ears, Thy truth entered my soul, and devout affections were raised within me.' As anything like a musical *performance* of public prayer and praise is surely absurd and irreverent, a choral rendering of the Church services must be improper. If clergymen desired to make use of the help of choice choral music, they might have special Services of Song or performances of oratorio in their churches. The only *artistic performances* permissible during Divine service, the writer ventures to think, are the anthem and the organ voluntary; and it would be well if there were reason to believe that these were always such in quality and rendering as to excite feelings of devotion in congregations. But there are some who separate Church music and devotion, and admire music for its own sake. These people go to church expressly to hear the music, and will speak rapturously of music and its effects. But if one may judge from the conduct of those people at St. Paul's and the Abbey, who listen attentively to the music, and hurry away as soon as the anthem is finished, it is possible for people to hear well-rendered choral services and not derive much benefit from them.

In considering the arguments of those who advocate the choral service, the writer has stated some of the objections of those who oppose it. The chief objection to the choral service and its use in a 'House of Prayer' arises from the fact that it is a musical or artistic performance by a few, of that which ought to be rendered spiritually by all. And it may be objected, further, that even from the purely musical point of view the choral service is a failure—being of necessity often imperfectly rendered by the choristers, and always spoiled when the congregation attempt to take part in it. Among those who object to the choral service from the devotional or spiritual point of view, are many people who are by no means wanting in love for music. And these think that the choral service may be, at least in some degree, a delusion and a snare. It is painfully clear to them that such a service—whether

found in connection with the spectacular element or not, is but a sensuous worship, and therefore does not come up to the standard of St. John iv. 24. This objection is a serious one, and not to be regarded lightly. To many people the monotone and response-singing are especially offensive; and certainly there is no reason to suppose that petitions so offered have any more force than those said in the natural voice. However delightful its effect in the psalmody, music seems not to mingle with the beautiful and devotional prayers of the Church service, which, highly satisfactory when said, lose very much in devotional effect when sung. In some parts of the Church service this is very noticeable. The opening of the Litany is especially solemn. In the first three petitions we address each Person of the Holy Trinity separately, and in the fourth the Triune God, and acknowledge ourselves to be miserable sinners and call for mercy. All this is so solemn, that it is inconceivable that any person should think of *singing*, or need the help of music to stir up his devotion at such a moment. Let an intelligent heathen who was accustomed to the speech of Englishmen, and had been instructed in the fundamental tenets of our religion, but had never heard a Church service—let this man be taken to some of our churches where the Litany is sung or monotoned. At one church he would see a number of people sitting together in a particular part of the building, and these people, after the clergyman had sung some words to a strain of music, would repeat the same song, perhaps with the accompaniment of a musical instrument. At another church the clergyman and those people who sat apart would not sing, but make a strange noise—something between humming and bawling—or perhaps the clergyman would read, and take no part in the humming and bawling. At another church a few people near the stranger would try to do as those who sat near the clergyman did, but the mass would make no sound of any kind. If this heathen were shown the words of the Litany, his amazement would know no bounds. He would probably ask if only those people who sat apart needed the mercy craved for, and why they sang tunes and spoke in such a strange voice when they addressed their

God. If told that the supplications gained in effect by being wedded to music or monotoned, he would reply that such prayers wanted nothing to give them beauty and solemnity, and that people should not be anxious about 'effect' when they utter such solemn words. He would ask how some of those people, if they felt that they were indeed miserable sinners, could ask for mercy in such a tuneful manner, and others address the Deity in that noisy fashion. The present writer has noticed that many choristers who monotone raise their voices at the commencement of the Litany, as if they knew they had a stiff piece of work before them and were determined to do it creditably. This noisy rendering of the first four sentences of the Litany sounds bold and irreverent, though choirs and congregations who are accustomed to it probably do not notice it. The writer has entered into this, because, so far as he is aware, the attention of clergymen has never been directed to it. The Creed, which is simply a confession of faith, is performed musically, sometimes in harmony, with shading and marks of expression, and sometimes in monotone, with hideous discords on the organ. Some people appear to think that a confession of faith must be incomplete unless they add bodily movements to the recitation of the Creed—congregations turning in a particular direction as they repeat the Creed, and sometimes even prostrating themselves as they say some clauses.* The solemn petitions at the commencement of the Communion Service, for mercy and grace to keep God's Commandments, are often sung to tunes—and very pretty tunes they sometimes are. To the singing is added an organ accompaniment, so that these tunes have even the advantage of colouring, and organists sometimes throw in a few flourishes of their own as well. As the tune is found to become tedious, if repeated after all the Commandments, it is changed from time to time. It might have been thought that congregations would at least be suffered to say the General Confession after the minister; but this prayer has been set to

* The writer is not speaking of bowing at the name of the Saviour. He does not believe, with men of an extreme school, that there is something Popish in bowing during the recitation of this clause of the Creed.

music in harmony, and is rendered so as to seem more like an anthem than a general confession of their sins by a congregation. The Lord's Prayer, too, has been 'set,' and those who use the 'setting,' no doubt believe that they have improved on the old-fashioned ways of clergymen and congregations who *say* the prayer. But even the Amens, which the people should say at the end of the prayers, are musically performed, and sometimes with strange prolongations. In order to produce an effect, some clergymen drop their voices at one part of the service and raise them at another.* These, and the like changes in public worship, are thought to render our services impressive and more beautiful. But, in the opinion of most people they offend good sense, hinder devotion, and are so many instances of the abuse of music. And it is not surprising that serious men dislike the introduction of all this music, and say, with Augustine, 'Cast out the bondwoman.' It does not satisfy those who admire the simple, spiritual worship of the Prayer-book to be told that prolonging the Amen is an Eastern practice, and that a musical creed has 'a fine effect.' To them the Creed is simply a confession of faith, which it is the Christian's duty and privilege to make before the congregation; and they do not believe that such a confession made vicariously by a number of choristers, though it be clothed in the grandest and most expressive music, and accompanied with a fine organ, can be as truly the confession of a congregation's faith as another in which men speak for themselves in a natural, manly way. And they feel assured that the earnest prayer of men whose thoughts are on their prayers, and not on musical sounds, must be more effectual than prayers, Kyries, and responses musically rendered by a few persons who, if they will sing decently, must give so much attention to the music that they can hardly think, as much as they ought, of the spiritual nature of the work they are engaged in. Even among the lovers of choral services there

* A leading Church paper recently quoted the following from a Dublin paper: 'In the Dublin use, the priest, in passing from the Exhortation to the Confession, ascends a full tone, which conveys to a congregation an intensified earnestness so suitable to a united acknowledgment of sin.' (!)

are probably few who, if they gave the subject a little consideration, would not concede that the singing of prayer and supplication, with or without instrumental accompaniment, is a strange and unnatural way of offering up our petitions, or would deny that the earnest, fervent prayer of two or three people in a congregation may avail more than the most exquisite musical rendering of the Church service by singers employed for the purpose. That the choral service is uncongregational its heartiest advocates would scarcely deny, for in most congregations the number of those who can take part in it must be small. From the *purely musical* point of view choral services are generally unsatisfactory; that is, they are often imperfectly—not to say wretchedly—done.* If response-singing is unaccompanied, the choir fall in pitch till they get as low as they well can. The different parts in the harmony are out of tune with one another if the organ is silent. Even unaccompanied Amens are seldom sung in tune; they are often so false that it is excruciating to hear them. If a soft organ accompaniment is used, and the choristers do not listen very attentively to it, the effect is worse than before. Indeed, the use of the organ, though almost always required to keep the singers up to pitch and in tune with one another, is not satisfactory, from whatever point of view the innovation may be regarded. The effect of the instrument accompanying response-singing is often most distressing. But as it is impossible for all but the most practised choristers to sing the service without instrumental help, the choral service, when rendered without the organ, is seldom satisfactory, even from the lowest, or musical point of view. Not only do choirs render it badly, but congregations, if they attempt to take part in it, make it still worse. It is often complained that the people do not sing well in the hymns. If this is so, how shall they take part in the choral service (which requires the best voices and the nicest ears to render it tolerably) and not spoil it?

The results of this inquiry are, that the choral service, to be

* In the *Times* there lately appeared a letter, severely criticising the 'fourth-rate concerts' clergymen provide for their congregations.

a success musically, requires a perfectly-balanced and highly-trained choir that can sing without the help of an organ; and that, if the congregation take part in the performance, they will certainly spoil it. But as such choirs are seldom found, and some people *will* try to join in everything that is sung in the Church service, the choral service generally is a failure—at least, musically—and is greatly inferior to a well-rendered plain service, in which all who will may safely take part. If the choral service is (as many people believe) the best form of service for use in cathedrals and churches with choral establishments, the plain service is certainly the safest and best for use in parish churches. Viewed from a higher, or a spiritual, point of sight, the choral service seems unsatisfactory. For listening to intoning, response-singing, and service-music, though pleasing, is not devotion. Silence is not praise, and listening to singing, and thinking how beautiful it is, is not prayer. Admitting that good choral singing (*when it can be had*) is impressive, and may for the moment do the hearer some good, Christian men and women do not, or should not, go to church to receive such impressions. Our business there is 'to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at God's hands, to set forth His most worthy praise, to hear His most holy Word, and to ask those things which are requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the soul.' It was not the intention of the Fathers of the Reformed Church of England, when they placed that Exhortation at the commencement of Morning and Evening Prayer, that a few men and women, or men and boys, should render the services musically (and, by so doing, purify and elevate men's minds); but they hoped that *as many as were present* at Divine service would accompany the clergyman '*with a pure heart and humble voice*, unto the throne of the heavenly grace.'

The rage for 'musical' services is excessive and increasing. Not only are the morning and evening services rendered musically, but even the Communion Service is sometimes sung—though how any clergyman of the Reformed Church of England can countenance a musical performance of this service passes the comprehension. If the music is introduced to

give 'effect,' such effect is out of place; if to add to the solemnity of the service, it is not in the power of music to do so, though it may largely take from it: if to draw communicants to the Lord's Table, that is not the office of music, and people so drawn would probably do better to stay away. It is important to note that at some churches music of Romish tonality is used in the Communion Service. At others portions of the service are called by names borrowed from the Mass—by which name, indeed, some clergymen call the Communion Service.* Thus the Communion Service, or 'Mass,' in some churches presided over by clergymen who are receiving the revenues, living in the rectories, and filling the pulpits of the Protestant Church of England, has its *Kyrie*, *Credo*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Sanctus*, *Agnus Dei*, and *Benedictus*, besides proper introits, graduals, and antiphons. The Lord's Prayer at such churches is called a 'Paternoster,' and rendered musically; the Amen is a little anthem; and 'Ave Verums' and 'Ave Marias' are often sung. At some churches Masses composed for use in Roman Catholic churches are sung at 'High Celebrations.' At such churches are found, in fit keeping with all this Mass-music, 'altars' built and arranged in imitation of those in Roman Catholic churches, sacrificing priests, dressed to resemble those of the Church of Rome, and claiming sacerdotal powers, and a multitude of symbols and ceremonies drawn chiefly from a source which clergymen of the Church of England once did not think the purest. That Romanizing clergymen in the Church of England sometimes succeed in their attempts to copy the Roman Catholic service appears from the fact that a French Roman Catholic gentleman, with whom the writer is acquainted, once chanced to enter one of their churches at a fashionable watering-place in the South of England, and did not discover that he was not in a veritable Roman Catholic church till after the service.

It is sad to notice a deadness in the responding and singing at some churches, where the services *are* simple, and such as the people might take part in if they would, and to hear so

* There lately appeared in a Church paper an advertisement for a 'Priest to sing High Mass every Sunday in the year.'

few voices joining in the spoken portion of the service, which ought to be said by all. Some people seem to nervously shrink from taking part in the responding, and some, perhaps, are careless. An earnest clergyman, finding it impossible to get his congregation to respond with any heartiness, reasoned with them from the pulpit, and said he hoped they would at least say the Creed in an audible voice. He did not effect a cure. In such a case some would prescribe the choral service or the monotone. When such a remedy is tried the depressing silence is certainly removed. But, although a great noise and bawling is heard to emanate from that part of the church in which the choir sit, the responding in the body of the church is no better than it was before; the services have become noisier, but *not* heartier. It is to be hoped that there are better means of stimulating congregations than introducing a choral service, which few people can take part in, and many are afraid of attempting. Perhaps the clergyman just mentioned might have succeeded if he had got the promise of a number of his congregation to respond heartily, and then asked them to sit together in little groups in different parts of the church. And the choir might have been requested to repeat the responses audibly. The church was rather a gloomy building, and had a low-pitched roof. At another church the lukewarm congregation would not *sing*. The clergyman tried to compel them to do so. His plan was to leave every other verse in the hymns to them. He too, failed; but he persisted till the thing became so ludicrous that he was obliged to give it up. In the verses that were left to the congregation, often only two persons were heard to sing —a woman in the nave, and the organist in the gallery. In this case the church was a bright one, but the monotone was used in the responses, and the hymns were often unsuited (devotionally and musically) for congregational use. If at the chapel to which the writer has made allusion there was no responding (to the best of his recollection), and yet the service was bright and hearty, how bright and hearty our services ought to be! In our churches the people's part—so admirably contrived for use in public worship—is printed, and

none who can read can plead inability to respond. A service in which the clergyman read, or, rather, prayed, the prayers, and all the people reverently answered in the natural voice—loudly in the Creeds and softly in the responses—and joined the choir with heart and voice in singing the Canticles, and (perhaps) the Psalms and some good, sterling hymns, would be grand and elevating indeed. Such united prayer and praise, one may believe, would rise up to heaven like incense. Compared with such a service, a musical performance of the Church service by the most consummate artists would seem poor indeed. A supposed objection to plain services remains to be noticed. It is not uncommon to hear such services called 'slovenly'—as if simplicity in worship implied slovenliness. But, it may be asked, are choral services generally so well rendered that the charge of slovenliness cannot be brought against them?

Though it has always been the custom to use the choral service at cathedrals and collegiate churches, there is no legal authority for its use in parish churches. In the choice of a kind of service, unhappily, 'everyone does that which is right in his own eyes.' But we are not without instructions. Opening the Prayer-book at the Order for Morning Prayer, we find no mention of anything like singing till we come to the *Venite*, which 'shall be said or sung.' (For the meaning of the terms, *reading*, *saying*, and *singing*, see Procter, 'History of the Book of Common Prayer,' p. 214, note.) We have the authority of the rubric for singing the *Venite*, as also the Psalms, Canticles, Creed, and (perhaps) the anthem at both Morning and Evening Service. The Athanasian Creed also may be sung, and the Litany. Turning to the Communion Service, we find no mention of singing till we come to the Creed, which may be sung, as also may the *Ter-Sanctus* and the *Gloria in Excelsis*. We find no mention in the Prayer-book of intoning—a practice which probably was borrowed at first from the heathen theatres, where, on account of the vast size of the buildings, it was necessary to have recourse to all kinds of expedients to strengthen the speakers' voices. While intoning and response-singing may be well enough, and even

necessary, in cathedrals, they cannot be required in ordinary churches; nor are they authorized. The Prayer-book, while permitting much singing in public worship, does not authorize a musical rendering of many parts of the service that are now sung, as the General Confession, the Lord's Prayer, the Amens, the Kyries, the Offertory Sentences, and the responses generally. A musical rendering of the *Agnus Dei* and *Benedictus*, and of the service generally was directed by the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., but it is not allowed by the present Office. There is no rubrical authority for singing a word of the Communion Service, except the Creed, *Ter-Sanctus*, and *Gloria in Excelsis*. The choir is not mentioned in the Prayer-book, but the people are supposed to take their own part in the service, which, indeed, is but reasonable, as they are met together for common prayer. Whatever may have been the case at cathedrals and collegiate churches, it seems to have been far from the desire of the compilers of the Prayer-book that the services *at parish churches* should be rendered chorally. Whatever effects enthusiastic musicians and some clergymen of the new school may ascribe to a well-rendered choral service, it cannot be too strongly urged that it is not the idea of the Prayer-book that the Church service should be made a kind of musical performance, from listening to which the people may derive considerable satisfaction and perhaps get some good. The only music other than congregational that is authorized in the Prayer-book, is the anthem; and it is not certain that even this was intended to be used in parish churches. The expression, 'in quires and places where they sing,' seems to point to cathedrals and churches with musical establishments and choral services. Indeed, the impossibility of parish churches rendering two anthems daily shows that this rubric was not intended for observance therein. The direction, 'Here followeth the anthem,' therefore, is not obligatory on parochial clergy, though it might, perhaps, be claimed as legalizing the performance of anthems in churches.

The choral service is no longer found only in its native home, the cathedral. It has been planted in places where it

will never live. Even in villages music, not content to be a handmaid, has forgotten her place and presumed to push public prayer and praise out of the sanctuary. This must often be due to the efforts of over-enthusiastic musicians. A clergyman once said, 'Give musicians too much of their own way, and they will ruin the services.' And though certainly not true of *all* musicians and lovers of music, his words will apply to those enthusiasts who are carried away by their love of the art till they seem to be in danger of forgetting the legitimate object of worship altogether. It is not meant by this to speak slightingly of enthusiasm, which, when controlled by sound judgment and properly directed, so far from being a bad quality in an artist, is absolutely necessary if anything really great is to be achieved. It may be safely said that not one of those monuments of human skill and genius, known as the Wonders of the Ancient World, would have been begun and finished without it. It is beautiful to read of the holy enthusiasm of David and Solomon when they were engaged, the one in collecting the material for the house of God, the other in building that glorious Temple. The grand and perfectly beautiful buildings at Athens must have been the work of enthusiasts. The sculptures that adorned the pediment of the Temple of Minerva, and are now known as the Elgin Marbles, stood at the height of some fifty or sixty feet above the ground—too far from the observer to be very narrowly scrutinized even in the clear air of Attica. Yet, although they were so far removed from close inspection, they were so exquisitely perfect that a sculptor of modern times* has said of that famous figure which has better escaped destruction than the rest,† that it were worth a man's while to come from Italy to see it. One could readily have understood that an artist would lavish all his skill on works that were intended to occupy a place where they would be nearly viewed. But when we find statuary so incomparably beautiful in design, so exquisite in detail, occupying a situation where much of its *perfection* must necessarily have been lost, we must for ever admire the enthusiasm of the artist, who,

* Canova. † The Theseus.

working for the Divinity, thought with the pious and wise Kings of Israel, that he could not work too well.

That latest novelty in Church music, the 'choral celebration,' happily is used at only a few places. Its introduction is probably more often due to the Romanizers in the Church than to musical enthusiasts. It is an illegal innovation, inasmuch as it is not prescribed in the Prayer-book, and it cannot but be condemned by all musicians and clergymen who love genuine Church music and desire the maintenance of Protestant worship. If the Prayer-book were allowed to decide whether our Church services should be choral or congregational—and its authority ought to be final with men who are bound by the Canon to use the orders, rites, and ceremonies it prescribes 'without diminishing or adding anything in the matter or form thereof'—the choral service would not be used at our parish churches. Choral services and choral celebrations would be swept away, and we should have plain services in which congregations could take part, and singing in which everyone could join 'with the understanding' and with the heart, 'singing and making melody in their hearts to the Lord.'

If clergymen were agreed to use no more music than the Prayer-book permits, there would still not be perfect uniformity in the quantity of music used in the services at different churches. There would be more singing at some churches than at others. There would be differences of opinion as to the best mode of rendering those parts of the service which may be 'said or sung.' While all would be for singing the Canticles and hymns, and, perhaps, the Psalms, some would also sing the Creeds and the Litany; and some would sing the *Ter-Sanctus* and *Gloria in Excelsis* in the Communion Service. It is strange to find that in some places the old Puritan objection to singing the Psalms still exists; for such a manner of rendering them appears to be very proper. At the same time, reading the Psalms is preferable to singing them badly; and if the congregation of any church cannot learn to chant them, the Psalms are much better read. In the Litany and Creeds singing seems quite out of place, and

a hindrance rather than a help to devotion. People cannot sing the Creeds and the Litany without giving some of that attention to their singing, which should be given entirely to their devotions. To confess one's faith to a musical tune and sing one's prayers seems not a little absurd. Musical Litanies and Creeds always seem very like a musical performance, and tend to make people forget where they are, and the purpose for which they are assembled. When imperfectly rendered—as must generally be the case—they jar on the ear and are in every way distracting. The *Sanctus* and the first portion of the *Gloria* are hymns of praise, and will bear the addition of music. But the Communion Service probably would gain nothing in beauty or solemnity by a musical rendering of these two hymns, unless the music used were very suitable and very well sung. There would, in most places, be a difficulty in getting a sufficient attendance of the choir to render the music well. The presence of non-communicants at the Communion Service is against all rule. But it would be monstrous to force the choristers to communicate. It is surely not a little fault in 'Choral Celebrations' that they require for their performance the presence of the choristers, who must all communicate whether they are duly prepared or not. It is worthy to be noted that in cathedral 'services' the only portions of the Communion Service that are set to music are the *Kyrie*, the Creed, and the *Sanctus*. The *Gloria*, sometimes used in cathedrals on great festivals, is not found in the older 'settings.'*

After hearing the Church service rendered in many different ways, the present writer came to the conclusion that far more music than is profitable is often used in churches; and that a little good and well-rendered congregational music—the Canticles, two or three good hymns, and, where possible, the Psalms—is all the music required in parish churches. All the rest of the service, from the opening sentences to the benediction and final 'Amen' after the sermon, to be thoroughly understood by the congregation, and partaken in

* It has been set by some quite modern composers (as Dykes and Ouseley).

spiritually, should, it seems to him, be spoken by the clergyman and people in a natural voice. Should any clergyman who had a really good choir think it desirable to use some choral music, he might have a plain service, which would be rendered by all, and anthems which would be sung by the choir only.*

If clergymen wish to have congregational singing worthy of the name at their churches—singing that everyone may take part in—they should use only simple music. Success will be impossible if music that is too elaborate be used. Unsuitable for congregational use—because beyond the powers of the people—are hymn-tunes and chants they cannot sing, and those musical settings of the Canticles called 'Services.' In many places it will be found quite impossible for the congregation to learn to chant the Psalms. The writer ventures to refer to what he says on the subject of hymns, hymn-tunes, and chants in Chapters I. and III. For the Canticles we should use chants, carefully avoiding those with high reciting-notes. 'Services,' though admirable for use in cathedrals, were never intended for congregational singing. Attwood in F is a magnificent piece of choral music—and beautiful is the effect of it when rendered by a fine choir in some grand old cathedral—but nothing could be less congregational, nothing less suitable for use at a parish church. There are, however, easy settings which (those who recommend service-music claim) remove the difficulty about the division of the *Te Deum*, and have other merits.† But while fine service-

* The objection many clergymen have to anthems is truly remarkable. These gentlemen are even more opposed to choral performances than the writer: who, while he advocates simplicity in public worship, has never been able to understand why anthems should be proscribed at churches where they might be well rendered.

† At many churches the *Te Deum* is divided, by a change of chant, at verse 16. But surely it would be better to divide this canticle into three parts: verses 1-9, 10-19, and 20-29; the three divisions respectively expressing praise, confession of faith, and supplication. The first division might be sung to a jubilant double chant, the second to another double chant, and the third to a quiet single chant. Or, perhaps, some would prefer to use a grand and solemn single chant for the second division.

music is too difficult for congregational use, really easy settings, so far as the present writer is acquainted with them, seem to be only weak compositions, and in every respect inferior to good tuneful chants. In churches where congregational singing is desired, it would be safest and best always to use chants for the Canticles. 'Services' are approved by composers of music; they afford opportunities to musicians to show off their skill in composing. But congregations cannot take part in them. To quote the words of a dignitary of the Church, they are 'a class of music by which composers get more credit than the congregations get good.' If we wish to have good, or even tolerable congregational singing, we must not choose tunes that exceed the range of ordinary, uncultivated voices (for it is chiefly with such that we have to deal). If we call the bass voice an octave below the contralto, and the tenor an octave below the treble, and then take the highest note of the contralto as the upper limit, and the lowest note of the soprano as the lower limit, we get the congregational compass. This rather rough and ready calculation gives a compass of an octave or a ninth, extending from E flat or D below to E flat or perhaps E natural above. With tunes that keep within this compass there is no difficulty. But are those that go beyond it to be discarded? We need not trouble ourselves about the low notes, for they are seldom written, and when sung are not very offensive. But when

---

The great burst of praise in verses 24, 25, though it comes in the third division, might be sung to the double chant used for the commencement of this noble hymn. The divisions might be more clearly marked out by change of key. If the first of the three chants were in the key of C, the second might be in F, G, or A flat, and the third in C. Chants in the minor mode do not seem suitable for the *Te Deum*. The rendering of the canticle might be made more effective (yet not uncongregational) if verses 1-6, 10-15, 18, 24, 25 only were sung by both sides of the choir; verses 11-13 perhaps being sung in unison or octaves, the organ playing in six-part harmony and the *tempo* being slower during these three verses.

To avoid the difficulty occasioned by the number of the verses being odd, verses 10 and 11, or 11 and 12, or 12 and 13 are sometimes joined—a barbarous expedient, to which recourse need not be had if verse 9 is sung to the second half of the chant.

tunes pass the upper limit of the congregational compass, the case is one of serious difficulty, especially if the pace is slow and the high notes have not been written with judgment; for people either sing these notes very loudly—often with a shrill, piercing scream—or omit them altogether, or drop their voices an octave (like a rank of pipes that breaks at a certain note) when they find the tune getting too high for them. Altering the tunes is out of the question, and transposing them into lower keys, though it would help the congregation, could not always be done without inconveniencing the choir; and then there is the question of character of key. However, as hymns are by general consent peculiarly the property of the congregation, their convenience ought to be consulted before that of the choir. Perhaps the best plan is to transpose tunes that go too high, and let the whole choir sing the melody with the congregation, if the parts, after transposition, are found to run too low. Tunes that go both too high and too low are more difficult to treat. The tune to the 'Easter Hymn' ought to be transposed a tone lower, as is often done, if only to get rid of the high F sharp, which is a very dreadful note unless it is drowned with a loud organ accompaniment. But in the first two verses the organist cannot play a loud organ in the strain in which the F sharp occurs; it is only in the last verse that he can play this strain loudly, and here, indeed, at the words, 'Now above the sky He's King,' he may even use the full organ without being accused of want of taste. The tune might be played a tone lower without inconveniencing the choir, though the basses would have a low note or two; but several low C's would now appear in the melody, and although the altos and basses in the congregation would be strong on these notes, the other voices would find them very low. However, after weighing the arguments for and against, it would seem desirable to transpose the tune.

There can be no doubt that congregational singing is often very poor. But is this surprising when it is remembered that the people receive no instruction? There ought to be a weekly practice for the congregation, which as many as possible should attend. The organist would not deem it

sufficient merely to take the people through the tunes for the following Sunday, but would give them some instruction as well. The people should be taught to sing in tune, and to listen to the organ, and not drag behind. They will naturally follow the organ in the matter of *piano* and *forte*. They should further be instructed to sing the melody without making alterations in it. Unisonous singing should be encouraged, and improvised harmonies and that modern species of *organum*, known as 'singing seconds,' should be vigorously denounced. In churches where the Psalms are chanted, pointed psalters should be provided, and the people should be shown how to use them. (But it would often be vain to expect a congregation to learn to chant the Psalms well.) The people should be taught to think of what they are singing, and it should be pointed out that loud, careless singing is not devotional. Those who have unmusical voices should be requested to sing in a subdued tone of voice, and those to whom nature has denied both a voice and an ear, should sing as softly as possible. While it is delightful to hear a congregation joining in the singing, it is not a little unpleasant to people who have nerves when they find themselves in the near neighbourhood of someone who has a voice of very disagreeable quality—perhaps a loud, rasping voice—and will always sing his loudest, though he cannot, or perhaps will not try to, sing in tune.* The organist should show the congregation how necessary it is that they should sing 'with the spirit and with the understanding' (1 Cor. xiv. 15), and not, as the Homily quaintly expresses it, 'with the chattering of birds.' These are 'taught by men to prate they know not what; but to sing with understanding is given by God's holy will to the nature of man.' 'To sing with the spirit and with the understanding will be the desire of every real Christian. The grace of God is here, as in every holy duty, the first and all-essential requisite. To sing with the spirit we need the power from on high, grace in the heart, and the present exer-

* Unfortunately, it would require more tact than most men possess to put this to the people and not give offence, and some who have very bad voices, think themselves excellent singers.

cise of that grace by the immediate and direct aid of the Holy Spirit, communicating and exciting and stirring up holy affections within (Col. iii. 16; Ephes. v. 18, 19). The sweetness of the music may be rather a hindrance than a help, if it engross our minds, or turn them away from the thoughts of prayer and praise. Augustine says, "When the tune has moved me more than the subject, I feel guilty." '*

Some think that if plain, spoken services and simple music in which all might take part, were revived, and the choral service laid aside, this would be equivalent to lowering the standard of Church music. But this is a misconception. The change would be rather in the quantity than the quality of the music, though, doubtless, music which might produce an *exquisite* effect when rendered by a well-trained choir only, would lose much when a great number of uncultivated voices joined in singing it. But when a congregation join in the psalmody, an effect of another kind is gained, which choir singing can never produce. The effect of a great number of voices singing in unison may not be exquisite, but it is grand. Good congregational singing lacks the delicate shading which can be got from a good choir, but has a breadth and volume which can never be obtained from a handful of singers. Dr. Burney, writing of the singing he heard at the Lutheran church at Dresden, says: 'The whole congregation, consisting of nearly three thousand persons, sing in unison melodies almost as slow as those used in our parish churches, but the people, being better musicians here than with us, and accustomed from their infancy to sing the chief part of the service, were better in tune, and formed one of the grandest choruses I have ever heard.' There seems to be no reason why such singing as this should not be introduced into our churches and flourish.

It may, perhaps, be objected that if hearty, congregational services were introduced at churches, and only canticles, hymns, and Psalms were sung (the rest of the service being said in the natural, speaking voice), there would be no need of good organists and carefully trained choristers; that the

* From the Preface to Bickersteth's 'Christian Psalmody.'

choir-singing would be both spoiled and unheeded if the congregation sang; and that organists already have enough to do for the little salaries they get, without having to instruct the people in psalmody. But these objections weigh very little. Skilful and judicious accompanists to lead and support congregations of singers would be most necessary, and the help of good choristers to lead the people would be very valuable. That their efforts would no longer be heard to the best advantage and listened to with rapt attention by mute congregations, should not be a source of grief to church musicians. Organists and choristers have no warrant for arrogating to themselves the sole right to render the Church services. Enough for them that they are privileged to *lead* the praises of the sanctuary.* The voluntary would afford organists an opportunity to show their proficiency, and the zeal of choirs and the time and pains bestowed on them by the organist need not be thrown away. For choirs might occasionally sing an anthem, or they might render themselves very acceptable by giving special Services of Song in church, or sacred performances on a grander scale. The organist's is a poorly paid profession: it is, indeed, one of much work and little pay. But the efforts of a man who exerted himself in the cause of congregational singing and improved the psalmody, would, one hopes, be appreciated by the people and rewarded with an increase of salary.

The writer has already spoken about the unfitness and un-English character of 'choral celebrations' of the Holy Communion, and the attempts made by some clergymen to render this solemn service uncongregational and as like the Roman Catholic service of the Mass as they can. He has shown that the Prayer-book gives no authority for the use of music in the Communion Service, except in the Creed, *Sanctus*, and *Gloria in Excelsis*. It may be permitted him now to quote some portions of a letter written to a Church paper by one who evidently is fond of choral celebrations, and well acquainted with them. According to this writer,

* Luther, himself a great lover of music, and no mean musician, said, 'The singing is for the congregation, and not for the choristers.'

the responses (by which he means the Amens, the *Sursum corda*, the 'Paternoster' after the Communion, and the response before and after the Gospel) and the intonation to the *Credo* and *Gloria*, should be sung invariably to the plain chant. This writer loves plain-song. 'It is felt,' he tells us, 'that there is a failure in Anglican settings when simplicity is aimed at. Either the music is washy, or is a milk-and-water melody, which soon tires after a few repetitions.' 'The Creed, which,' he says, 'the congregation should certainly try to sing, because it is their great hymn of faith, is best sung to one of the plain chant settings, such as that of Merbecke, or one of those known as the *Missa de Angelis*, *Missa in Duplicibus*, or Dumont's Mass in the first mode, known as the *Missa Regia*, or that in the second mode by the same writer.' 'On the highest festivals,' he says, 'such as Christmas, Easter, Whit Sunday, the Dedication of the church, perhaps it is legitimate to have a modern service.' 'In those churches where the music is really good, or what I will call classical, and well sung by a trained choir, the congregation,' he tells us, 'is not intended to sing, but to assist at the service with spiritual devotion; of which churches [one is glad to learn] there are not many.' It is worthy of notice that the Lord's Prayer, in the above extracts, is not called by its good old English name, but by one borrowed from the Latin. It is rendered musically by the choir, although the rubric says, 'The priest shall say the Lord's Prayer, the people repeating after him every petition.' The Nicene Creed is called a hymn, of the nature of which it in no way partakes. While all will agree with this writer in his estimate of much modern Church music, few will concede that a plain-song rendering of the Communion Service is more satisfactory than one in which the people say the responses in a natural, speaking voice. The expression of doubt as to the propriety, or lawfulness, of having modern services on great festivals is curious. Since the Prayer-book does not authorize Choral Celebrations, whether to ancient or modern music, on any occasion whatever, one wonders whither the lovers of these 'celebrations' turn for the solution of such difficulties. One has also to

learn what authority there is for saying that 'the congregation is not intended to sing, but to assist at the service with spiritual devotion,' when the music is good and well rendered by the choir, since there is not a word to this effect in the Prayer-book. It is becoming common with the Romanizers and musical enthusiasts in our communion to appeal to the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. for authority for their practices. This book was a first attempt, and imperfect. It was hardly published before its deficiencies were discovered. It was the design of the compilers not to offend the people by too harsh a transition, and consequently the Prayer-book of 1549 was 'a connecting link between the Missal and the Prayer-book.' It was decidedly less Protestant than succeeding Prayer-books, and that is the reason why it is appealed to by those among us who wish to undo the work of the Reformation. Such men would doubtless like to substitute it for the present book. Edward's first Prayer-book was the rule for clergymen for the three years it was in use, and the service it prescribes was legal for that time. But when in 1552 a new Prayer-book appeared, the authority of the first was ended, and some things which had been sanctioned by the first book were no longer lawful. Since 1552 other alterations have been made. But clergymen, having solemnly pledged themselves to an undeviating use of the present book in the Church services, are concerned with none of these old Prayer-books.* Edward's first book and succeeding books, having passed away and become obsolete, neither are our guides in performing Divine service, nor can they justify the use of practices that are not prescribed in the present book. So long as clergymen continue to justify any departure they may choose to make from the liturgy by showing that they were prescribed in an old Prayer-book—instead of the whole realm having but one Use, there will be neither uniformity in the public services of the Church nor

* 'The question of authority . . . can be of little moment to those who now use our Prayer-book, as successively amended, and as fully authorized by Parliament and Convocation in 1662' (Procter, 'History of the Book of Common Prayer,' p. 41).

settled doctrine. If clergymen were permitted to mingle the ritual and rubrics of 1549 with those of the present Communion Office, they might not only have Choral Celebrations in their churches, but leave out the Commandments, omit the second clause of the words used in giving the Bread and Wine,* and make the sign of the Cross during the consecration of the Elements. If some clergymen do these and other un-Protestant things, and set up the Mass in their churches, they certainly have no authority for their proceedings given them by the Church they profess to serve. For all such practices there was no authority in the Church of England after 1552. This is quite certain, though ingenious quibblers are striving hard to darken the light.

It is not the intention of the writer to say a word against the Church of Rome. But it is well known that our Reformers strongly objected to the Roman practice of having Divine service in an 'unknown tongue.' It has not yet become customary with the Romanizers in our communion to use Latin in the services; but by encouraging intoning, and an excessive use of music, and introducing other practices which are not in accordance with the simplicity of the Protestant religion, clergymen have caused the services, in some churches, to be almost as unintelligible to our poorer brethren as if they were rendered in 'a tongue not understanded of the people.' The fact that a number of people of fashion (chiefly of the gentler sex) and musical enthusiasts like the choral service, does not justify us in using a kind of service which the humbler classes cannot understand. In 1 Cor. xiv., St. Paul is speaking of public worship. Prayer and praise and preaching, he tells us, should be in such a language as the congregation understand; else how shall they be able to follow the service? (verse 16). And then the Apostle gives the two grand rules: 'Let all things be done unto edifying,' 'Let all things be done decently and in order.' It is perhaps

* Since this was written, the writer has read in the *Record:* 'Proof has reached us that in at least two English dioceses certain clergy consistently [with their other practices], omit the second part of the words of administration in the Lord's Supper.'

not too much to say that in most cases introducing the choral service, so far from 'edifying' the poor and unlearned, is equivalent to driving them from church. It is too much to expect of a reasonable being that he will attend a church where he cannot follow the service, much less take part in it. And yet, examples are not wanting of clergymen who cannot lay aside their idols, but must introduce the choral service—to be mangled by men and boys, surpliced to resemble cathedral choristers—and perhaps a paltry spectacle—a bad copy of the impressive ceremonial of the Church of Rome—at small towns and remote country villages for the edification of agriculturists! These men may, and doubtless do, draw some of their parishioners to church by the allurements of a sensuous worship, and the novelty of the service renders it attractive for a time; but they drive many away. Professing to abhor schism, they make men schismatics. If some passages in the Prayer-book are not clearly understood by many people, even when they are distinctly said, it is not probable they will become more intelligible when rendered in sing-song or set to music. And who can wonder if people, when they have to choose between an incomprehensible form of Church service and the simpler worship of the Dissenting chapel, drop off from attendance at church and join the chapel-folk? If clergymen call those 'weak brethren' who are offended and leave church because of their innovations, St. Paul has something to say to them in 1 Cor. viii. The pre-Reformation services—which Romanizers seek to revive—were complicated, and though possibly felt to be grand and imposing by those who understood them, could not have been congregational. But our present Church service, *when conducted strictly on Prayer-book lines*,* is all beauty and

* How seldom is this the case! Besides those who prefer the Romish doctrines and practices to the Anglican, there are men in the Church whose doctrines and ideas of public worship seem to differ little (if at all) from those of the Calvinistic Methodists. Between these extreme schools there are many grades. Since opinions on Church worship are so various, and many clergymen hold themselves at liberty to make departures from the Prayer-book, it has come to pass that in many towns there are not

solemnity, and yet so simple that it may be followed intelligently by all classes, 'high and low, rich and poor, one with another.'

Though pleasing to the ear when very well rendered, and capable, when all the conditions are favourable, to stir the emotions for the moment, elaborate musical services seem poor indeed when compared with simple, hearty, and devotional services, which appeal to the spiritual nature of man, and in which all can take part. Even if they could satisfy the spiritual wants of pious people of culture, they must necessarily fail to benefit unlearned people. Enjoyed by the few, they are as a stumbling-block placed in the way of the many, and especially of the poor and ignorant, who (it is important to remember) not only have an equal right with the educated to take part in public worship at their parish churches, but need spiritual help as much as their worldly betters.*

Clergymen who think to make their services beautiful by having them musically rendered, perhaps mistake ornament for beauty. It is one thing to ornament the Church service; another to make it more beautiful. If 'beauty needs not the foreign aid of ornament,' surely our beautiful Liturgy needs not to be adorned with a strange dress. But the Liturgy is not only perfectly beautiful, and consequently independent of ornament, but it positively suffers when musically rendered, the services losing as much in beauty as they gain in ornament. The musical robe may *sometimes* be an elegant one, but it always hides the beauty of the thing it adorns.

---

two churches in which Divine Service is rendered in the same fashion, and in many places it is difficult to find a church in which the form prescribed in the Prayer-book is strictly followed.

* 'Nothing should be done in the church in vain; and this thing ought chiefly to be laboured for, that the unlearned also might take profit, lest any part of the body should be dark through ignorance.'—*Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments.*

CHAPTER III.

CHANTS.

THE chant does not appear to have degenerated like the hymn-tune. We have numerous excellent chants, old and new.

There are five principal kinds of Anglican chants: the jubilant double chant, which is cheerful, stirring, and suited to psalms of praise; the quiet double chant, which is calm, though more suited, perhaps, to praise than to prayer; the single chant major, which, though generally calm, may be either jubilant or prayerful; the double chant minor, which is plaintive; and the single chant minor, which is very mournful.

The old jubilant chants were often very florid; and such chants are either omitted by modern compilers, or their overgrowth is pruned, the quavers and dotted crotchets being removed, to the great improvement of the chants. In some cases even the crotchets have been removed, and only the minims and semibreves suffered to remain. But surely this is carrying the pruning process too far. The melody of some chants certainly has been spoiled by the excision of the passing-notes. The old chants have perhaps gained something in dignity, but they have certainly lost much in tunefulness by being treated in this fashion.

Quiet double chants and single chants major are the most useful chants we possess; they suit almost any words, except those which are very jubilant or very plaintive. Minor chants are hard to sing in tune, and for this reason should be avoided as much as possible; quiet single chants major being used

instead of them, unless in short psalms, when minor chants may be used.

Although there is a certain monotony in single chants, some prefer them to double chants, which they would reject altogether. Those who would use only single chants point out that some of the psalms will not bear setting to double chants. But the editors of the 'Cathedral Psalter' were fully aware of the difficulty, and knew how to meet it. (See their admirable treatment of the 31st Psalm.)

There are yet other forms of chants: the quadruple chant, the occasions for using which must be few, and the Gregorian chant. The latter is lauded by some on the plea of its superior flexibility and grandeur, and esteemed by others for its venerable age. Its admirers would persuade us that it is the only kind of chant fit to be used in church.

Chants should be chosen to suit the words of the canticles and psalms they are set to. When the sentiment of a psalm changes, the chant may appropriately be changed for another. Such changes, if made but seldom and always with meaning, produce a very happy effect. But they should never be made without very good reason, as they are confusing to congregations, who are not prepared for them. In Psalm lxxvii. a change from a minor to a major chant might be made at verse 11. In Psalm lxxviii. verses 1-17, 53-56, 66-73 might be sung to a major, and the rest of the psalm to a minor chant. In Psalm lxxxix. a major chant might be used for the first thirty-six verses, and a minor for the remainder.*

* It is not necessary that all the chants to which a psalm is sung be in the same key, but there should be key-relationship between them. A chant in the major mode may be followed by one in the key of the dominant, sub-dominant, or relative minor; one in the minor mode, by one in the key of the relative major, dominant major, sub-dominant minor, or sub-mediant major (a change from tonic minor to tonic major is rather hazardous). A chant in the major mode may also be followed by another of which the tonic is a major third below that of the first. Thus a chant in the key of C major might be followed by one in G major, F major, A minor, or A flat major; and a chant in the key of C minor might be followed by one in E flat major, G major, F minor, or A flat major. But a chant in the key of C major following one in the key of

In pointing the Canticles and Psalms, such absurdities as the following should be avoided: 'Our four fathers' (for 'our forefathers'), 'en-e-mees' (for 'enemies'), 'equ-ah-tee' (for 'equity'), 'cov-ee-*nant*' (for 'covenant'), 'she-eep' (for 'sheep'), 'le-vi-a-*than*' (for 'leviathan'), 'My misdeeds prevail against *me*' (Against whom else should they prevail?), 'Judah was his sanc-tua-ree' (for 'Judah was his sanctuary'). Mr. Joule (p. 25 of the preface to his 'Collection of Chants') gives the following examples of the stultification of the sense by incorrect pointing: 'In the courts of the Lord's house, even in the midst of thee.—O Jerusalem, praise the Lord' (for 'In the courts of the Lord's house, even in the midst of thee, O Jerusalem. Praise the Lord'); 'The truth of the Lord endureth.—For ever praise the Lord' (for 'The truth of the Lord endureth for ever. Praise the Lord.') At a certain church the pointing is such that the accents almost always fall on the shortest and least important words. The chanting there reminds the hearer of one of Dickens' amusing American characters, who laid much stress on all the little words, as if he thought the big ones were able to take care of themselves.

C minor, would probably not be sung in tune. The chants should be so chosen that the change from the final chord of the first to the initial chord of the second shall be such as can be made without creating any wrong progression, or violating the rules of harmony. The second chant can seldom be well chosen if it has for the first note in the treble the tonic of the new key. The first chord of the second chant should contain as many notes as possible (at least *one*) of those forming the last chord of the first chant.

CHAPTER IV.

GREGORIAN MUSIC.

ONE of the most remarkable features of Gregorian music is its tonality, which is quite different from that of modern music. If anyone play the scales of D, E, F, G, A on a pianoforte, with the proper sharps and flats, and then repeat them without using any of the black keys, he will form a fairly correct idea of the difference between our modern tonality and the Gregorian.* If they are to sound at all pleasant in the ears of people accustomed to modern music, it is necessary to alter the Gregorian melodies by using accidentals. But sharps and flats were not permitted in the Gregorian system, and 'Gregorians,' when their tonality is changed by the introduction of them, are genuine 'Gregorians' no longer.

But the chants have not only been altered; they are even performed with a harmonized organ accompaniment, and sometimes actually sung in harmony—the harmony used being not that of Hucbald's *Organum* (which by reason of *its* great age would be the most appropriate), but modern harmony, which in Gregory's time was absolutely unknown. From these and unavoidable causes, 'Gregorians' have lost much of the genuineness, while they have retained not a little of the solemn ugliness of the old melodies. If Gregory could enter a modern English Church and hear 'Gregorians' as there rendered, he would not recognise his own music.

* The natural diatonic scale, in which all modern music is written, was not used by the early ecclesiastics. In the Middle Ages it was called *il modo lascivo*, or 'the wanton key,' and only street-musicians used it.

It is claimed by the admirers of 'Gregorians' that these melodies are of great antiquity. But antiquity cannot be claimed for 'Gregorians' when they are tortured out of shape and rendered in modern fashion. The genuine chants are old enough. Some of them are even older than Gregory. St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, composed, collected, and arranged his chants two hundred years before Gregory. St. Augustine says that Ambrose brought his manner of singing the psalms and hymns from the East. And some modern writers have held that not only the Ambrosian system, and antiphony, but even the tunes themselves were Oriental in source, and probably the very melodies that had been used in the Temple service. Others who have studied the Greek music, as described by the old theorists, hold that the source of the chants was Occidental, and believe that the tunes were borrowed from the pagans. There is nothing improbable in the theory which gives a pagan source to these melodies. Before the time of Ambrose (who lived in the latter half of the fourth century) the Roman Church, in her desire the more easily to wean the pagans from their superstitions and draw them to church, had already begun the practice of adopting heathen customs and mingling them with the Church service. But whatever may have been their source, genuine Gregorian melodies are interesting for their antiquity, and to hear a correct performance of them, with the Latin words to which they properly belong, would be both curious and instructive.

But their great age is an insufficient reason for preferring these feeble beginnings of Church music to the tunes of modern times, and affirming them to be the best music for use in public worship. If men of culture admire ancient literature, statuary, and architecture (which are still older than the music of Gregory, Bishop of Rome), this is not because the literature, statuary, and architecture are ancient, but because they are *beautiful*. But 'Gregorians' (made when what we call music was unknown) are not beautiful, though doubtless they would appear excellent music to Gregory and his contemporaries, who had heard nothing better. It would surely be absurd to lay aside English, as it is now spoken, and

adopt the venerable language of Caedmon, Alfred, and Ælfric in public worship. Our congregations would be more surprised than edified if they were requested to say, 'So to become thin rice' for 'Thy kingdom come.' But the revival of an unintelligible language for use in the Church services would hardly be more absurd than the restoration of a disused kind of music, which congregations could not understand or take part in. It is astonishing to hear that there are people in the Church of England who would sing hymns to Gregorian tunes and discard the Anglican chant, which is founded on a perfected musical scale, and set up the crude melodies of Gregory (which are barely tolerable, even when they are presented in a modern *un*-Gregorian form) in place of it. But the enthusiastic lovers of the old music can see nothing for the halo which time has placed about the head of their venerable saint.*

The Gregorian chant has indeed one point in its favour—it is not frivolous. It is ponderous. The effect of the *De Profundis*, when thundered out by a number of ecclesiastics, is said to be almost terrible. The present writer chanced to be in a church at Paris, and to hear a priest chant a funeral psalm with the accompaniment of an ophicleide. The effect was truly mournful.† But if Gregorian music is suitable for use at

* A society has been formed for the cultivation of Gregorian music, and a few dignitaries of the Church and some eminent musicians have lent their names to it. As these gentlemen may be supposed to be not ignorant of the tuneful and congregational character of our psalmody, as compared with Gregory's, we may wonder in what way they believe their attempts to revive the Gregorian *cantus* (should they be successful) would benefit our Church music. It is worthy of notice that one of the patrons of the society is a Roman Catholic bishop.

† The Gregorian *cantus* seems very much in place on such an occasion as the funeral of Raymond Berenger, in Scott's 'Betrothed.' The loud and mournful sound of the trumpets, which, uplifting and uniting their thrilling tones in a wild and melancholy death-note, apprised all that the obsequies were about to commence; the twelve black monks, headed by their abbot, and thundering forth the sublime notes of the Catholic *Miserere mei Domine;* the large cross; the chosen body of men-at-arms, walking in procession and trailing their lances; the body of the valiant Berenger, wrapped in his own knightly banner and borne upon lances;

funerals, its spirit and form are not such as suit our liturgy. We want simplicity, beauty, tunefulness, and brightness, and not gloomy solemnity in our Church music.

All the efforts of its most enthusiastic admirers—even though some of them are people of high standing—will not convince Churchmen that Gregorian music is tuneful and suitable for use in the public services of the Church. The task is too great for any authority, however respectable, to accomplish. As Berlioz says in his 'Treatise on Instrumentation,' 'The authority of a hundred old men, even if they were each a hundred and twenty years of age, cannot make ugly that which is beautiful, nor beautiful that which is ugly.' Though well adapted to the Latin service and Latin words, Gregorian music does not suit English words; and as it is, by reason of its peculiar tonality and rhythm, quite unfit for congregational singing, its use is opposed to the English theory of worship. Though it has always flourished in its home, the Roman Catholic Church, it is a plant which will not grow in a foreign soil.*

An able writer and one certainly not opposed to Gregorian music, in a learned paper on 'Plain-song' remarks, 'It has nothing in common with modern music.' And not only is this the case, but we do not even know how to render it properly. 'Under corrupting influences the true interpretation of a melody may in time be utterly lost. This has been

---

the gallant knights who walked as mourners and supporters of the corpse; the Constable of Chester, alone, and fully armed, following as chief mourner; the chosen body of squires, men-at-arms, and pages of noble descent, who brought up the rear of the procession; the nakers and trumpets echoing back, from time to time, the melancholy song of the monks, by replying in a note as lugubrious as their own—one feels that all these harmonize perfectly.

* Luther, who disliked Gregorian music, and compared it to the braying of an ass, said the Roman Catholic Church would never fall as long as Gregorians were kept up. Writing to Bullinger, in 1549, Hooper says of Bonner and his followers: 'Et ne pereat papatus, sacrificuli etsi Latinum idioma abrogare coguntur, tonum eundem ac musicam semper diligentissime observant, quem hactenus in papatu solebant.'—Procter, 'History of the Book of Common Prayer,' p. 30, note.

the case with Plain-song; and you will therefore perceive what a field of research lies open before us when we attempt to restore the original method of rendering it, and have for guide only such vague indications as I will presently lay before you.'

The late Dr. Dykes, in a lecture on Church Music, reprinted in the *Organ World* of September 1, 1888, after speaking of the paucity of the pure Gregorian melodies, and the mediæval method of enlarging the number of chants by torturing these melodies into new forms, said: 'I am not speaking a word in disparagement of the old Gregorian chants. Their varying rhythms and quaint cadences I dearly love. To hear them well and intelligently sung and accompanied is to myself a great treat. But it is mere blind idolatry which refuses to see the practical value of the other system of chanting—first, more legitimate variety than Gregorians; secondly, they present fewer difficulties: (1) less difficulty in pointing; and (2) less difficulty in accompanying. (1) Less difficulty in pointing.—The rhythms and metres of the Gregorian chants are so different, that a psalm pointed to suit one chant will not suit another. These changes of rhythm are very pleasing, but create great practical difficulties; for you cannot have your Psalter pointed once for all and then select your chants. You must have each psalm pointed for its own chant. This cripples one very much. (2) But the difficulty in accompanying is also great. The structure of most of the chants is really inconsistent with such a tonal system as the laws of harmony demand, and, therefore, how best to clothe them with organ harmonies is a great problem. Take, for instance, the fourth tone. Who really knows how to harmonize this? And to hear an unskilled organist labour through it, with harmonies utterly crude and irrational, is no small penance to musical ears. I have occasionally heard the Gregorian chants very finely accompanied. But generally the practical difficulties which attend their successful rendering are so imperfectly overcome, that the Psalms, which should form one of the most delightful parts of the service, become a very "pain and grief." The choir and congregation may bawl out at the top

of their voices; still, one too often feels that the music is not such as the words of the sweet Psalmist merit, or such as is fit for an offering to God. Now, the Anglican system obviates both the difficulties I have mentioned . . . . In connection with harmony, I must not omit to notice another advantage which our English chants possess. Being written in modes which invite harmony, they are naturally susceptible of it. Now, harmonized music is essentially Christian. It is of an intrinsically higher order than unisonous, and surely pure vocal harmony is the most appropriate music for the sanctuary, and the most perfect and fitting offering to Him from whom all harmony proceeds. Why the Psalms, which should be the most delightful part of our ordinary morning and evening offices, should always be condemned to be sung (sometimes, I should say, howled) in unison I cannot tell. . . . We are bound to look for music which will suit congregational worship —music simple, broad, and susceptible of harmony. It is because so much of the mediæval plain-song, with its long vocal flourishes and wearisome multiplication of notes to one syllable, is so unsuited for congregational use, that I regret to see the attempts made to introduce so much of it into our services, especially into the Communion Office. A single priest or small choir of men singing in unison, accompanied, as we often hear them abroad, with an ophicleide, may perform such music well enough, and not without effect. But to attempt to force music of this character on a congregation of English worshippers, is, I am convinced, a great and serious mistake. I know nothing more wearying, more utterly painful to musical ears, than to hear some of these modern and most ill-judged adaptations. I forbear to specify instances. So, again, there is something fascinating in singing a hymn-tune with a pretty Latin title, and written in square notes; and I freely own that a few of these revived Latin tunes are well worthy of adoption, susceptible of pure harmony, simple, vigorous, and pleasing, and that most of them possess an interest for the antiquarian and musician; but I must express my candid opinion with regard to the majority of them, that to inflict them on a congregation is sheer, downright

cruelty. . . . To wed hymns to archaic strains, uncouth, unrhythmical, inharmonious, devoid of all power to move the people's hearts, is a great error.'

Mendelssohn does not appear to have liked 'Gregorians,' even when heard in their greatest perfection. Speaking of a performance of the *Tenebræ* he heard at the Pope's Chapel, he says: 'I cannot help it, but I own it does irritate me to hear such holy and touching words sung to such dull, drawling music. They say it is *canto fermo*, Gregorian, etc. No matter. If at that period there was neither the feeling nor the capability to write in a different style, at all events we have now the power to do so; and certainly this mechanical monotony is not to be found in the Scriptural words. They are all truth and freshness; and, moreover, expressed in the most simple and natural manner. Why, then, make them sound like a mere formula? And, in truth, such singing as this is little more! The word "Pater" with a little flourish, the "meum" with a little shake, the "ut quid me"—can this be called sacred music? There is certainly no false expression in it, because there is *none* of any kind. But does not this fact prove the desecration of the words? A hundred times during the ceremony I was driven wild by such things as these; and then came people, in a state of ecstasy, saying how splendid it had all been. This sounded to me like a bad joke, and yet they were quite in earnest.' (*Letters from Italy and Switzerland*, translated by Lady Wallace.)

The writer is indebted to a friend for the following amusing story:—A Scotch Presbyterian, on a visit to London, was taken by his host to hear a service at a church where the music was Gregorian. After the service, as the friends were going home, the Scotchman asked 'why they sang such queer tunes at that church.' When he was told that the tunes were old—very old—very old indeed, and that King David was supposed to have sung his psalms to them, he gravely remarked, 'Well, then, I don't wonder that Saul threw his javelin at him!'

PART II.

THE ORGANIST AND HIS INSTRUMENT.

'Awake, lute and harp.'—Psalm lvii. 8.

CHAPTER I.

THE PLACE FOR THE ORGAN (AND CHOIR)—WEST GALLERIES.

WHEREAS our church organs and choirs formerly were placed so that they could be heard to advantage, it is a matter of common observation that they are very often unfavourably placed now. Till comparatively lately the west gallery was thought to be the best situation for them; at present it is the fashion to place the singers in the chancel, and the organ somewhere near them. When no ingenuity can contrive a place for the instrument, a 'chamber' is built for it, and then the 'difficulty about the organ' is thought to have been satisfactorily dealt with.

As the organ still occupies its old situation (the west gallery) in Continental churches, it would be extremely interesting if we knew how a change, so detrimental to music, has been brought about in our own churches. It is not wonderful that an example—no matter how absurd—when it is set in some places should be followed in others, and at last become 'the fashion'; but we are often curious to know how a custom originated, to trace a fashion to its source.

Now, as it is inconceivable that musicians and organ-builders would choose the worst situations in churches wherein to erect organs, we must suppose, when we see organs unfavourably placed, that either the clergymen or the architects are to blame.

The architect objects to galleries; and side-galleries are, indeed, no improvement to a church. But without enumerating the objections that may be brought against side-galleries, it may be enough to say that west galleries are open to none

of them. If an architect is afraid lest an organ, because of its size, shall destroy the proportions of the church, or, by reason of a want of harmony in colour and design with the edifice, shall spoil his building, this is surely a reason why he should prefer, and not object to, its being placed in a west gallery, where it would not be seen during the service. He can, indeed, find other situations where the instrument shall not be seen; but these situations are not so satisfactory from a musical point of view, and the question is one of musical as well as architectural importance.*

But it is probable that the clergy, and not the architects, are to be blamed for the unfavourable position of church organs, and that the present fashion may be traced to Puseyite (or, as we call them, 'ritualistic') influences, and to a growing love for pomp and spectacle and musical services. This solution may, or may not, be the correct one, but it is suggested as extremely probable. It is certain that ritualistic theories and practices are more favoured than they once were, and simplicity less valued. Ritualism, and the love of pomp and spectacle, both demand a surpliced chancel choir, which shall perambulate the church in all the pomp and glory of procession and recession. But the white robes, the processions, and the movements of a choir which occupied a west gallery would not be seen by the congregation. The downright Ritualist sees in a surpliced chancel choir angels in Paradise.† Under the mistaken supposition that only a chancel choir can manage a choral service, the introduction of choral services is generally followed by the removal of the singers to the chancel. But such a service might be rendered by a choir in the gallery. If

* If there were a fine window in the west, it need not be hidden by the organ ; for the instrument might be divided into two portions, with the window in the middle. An organ which harmonizes with the gallery forms a handsome object at the end of the church, and, so to speak, completes the furnishing of the building.

† At a meeting of ritualists in East Anglia not long ago, a clergyman stated that the choir are 'robed in white to represent the angels'; and in a ritualists' hand-book the choir (chancel) of the church is said to represent Paradise. So that our surpliced church choristers represent angels in Paradise!

the choir began their Amens and responses promptly, and before the clergyman had quitted the last syllable of his reading or intoning, there would be no breaks. It is important to observe that the change from gallery to chancel has been made not only at churches where mediæval opinions obtain, where the ritual is high and the services are elaborate. There are chancel choirs at churches where the clergymen are of the Evangelical school. Indeed the desire for chancel choirs is pretty general, and the work of demolishing west galleries is going on in many places. Even at churches where the services are of the simple kind prescribed in the Prayer-book, the chancel position has been adopted, though with what object (if any) it is hard to conjecture. Perhaps the change may be ascribed to that craze for 'restoring' and 'improving' which has led us to spoil so much of the church-building of our forefathers; or the voices of those may prevail who, on ecclesiastical grounds, require the removal of the choir to the chancel; or perhaps some influential persons desire to arrange the church after the fashion of a cathedral.* But

* The surpliced choir, the choral service, and the chancel position are intimately connected, and are parts of one and the same system, the introduction of one generally leading to the introduction of one or both of the others. Thus: (1) The introduction of a surpliced choir, that the effect of the surplices and the genuflections (if any) may be enjoyed, demands the removal of the choir to the chancel. As at cathedrals (where the choristers are surpliced and sit in the choir) the services are choral, our innovators, when they have set up surpliced chancel choirs at their churches, proceed next to introduce the choral service. (2) The setting up of the choral service leads (though there is no reason why it should) to the removal of the choir to the chancel. This is followed by the substitution of boys for women, and these are surpliced, for decency! (3) The removal to the chancel, made perhaps with no better motive than the desire to follow fashion or to adopt an ecclesiastical theory, is almost always followed by the substitution of boys for women, it being a highly improper thing, according to mediæval opinion, for women to sit in the chancel. The change in the composition of the choir is soon followed by the introduction of the surplice, and the service probably begins to be choral.

Whatever may be thought of the choral service and the surpliced choir, it is sufficient here to lay stress on the fact that the removal of the choir to the chancel implies the removal of the organ (and the almost

however we may account for it, the choral service has been introduced at many churches, and surpliced choirs and processions are not uncommon. Even the organist is sometimes required to wear a surplice. The choirs of these churches no longer occupy the galleries, but are placed in the chancels, whither the organs follow them.

Now, if the change of situation were not detrimental to music—if the organ and the singing were as effective as they used to be when organs and choirs were placed in the gallery —musicians would have no reason to complain, and the present chapter need not have been written. But, unfortunately, it rarely happens that such is the case.

At a certain grand old parish church the organ and the choir always occupied the gallery, and the effect of the music at that church was very fine indeed, till a clergyman with decidedly 'high' views came and immediately had the choir placed in the chancel. It was, as a matter of course, found

certain deterioration of its tone), and the substitution of boys' voices for those of women, to the injury of the choral singing. But if choirs are intended to lead God's praises, and organs to lead and beautify the music of the sanctuary, any changes injuriously affecting them cannot be too heartily deprecated.

In Roman Catholic churches, the writer is informed, there are sometimes two choirs, of which one, consisting on great festivals of a considerable number of surpliced boys, called in France *les enfants de chœur*, does not sing, but merely assists the priest, keeping up an almost continual movement and gesticulation which may have been borrowed originally from the Greek Χορός. The other, or singing choir, consists generally of men and women, and occupies the west gallery with the organ. The authors of the strange innovations in our musical arrangements, if it was their intention to imitate the Roman Catholics, seem to have taken the wrong choir. The choirs at some of our churches do not seem to be regarded as musicians, whose sole business it is to sing ; but other duties are expected of them. This the following extracts, which might be multiplied greatly, from clerical papers will show : 'The clergy and choristers robed and unrobed at another church, marching to and from in procession with cross and banners.' 'The service (the baptism of a little baby) was chorally rendered by a full choir, and the procession to the western entrance was headed by a splendid crucifix.' 'A procession of clergy and choir from the mansion to the church was headed by incense and candle-bearers, and a crucifix of the blessed sacrament of the Virgin was also carried.'

necessary to move the organ and place it near the choir (which now began to be surpliced). The changes made, it was at once apparent that the instrument, though considerably enlarged, did not tell as well as before, and that its mellowness was gone from it. Nor was the singing so effective. Something was gained in spectacle, and mediævalists were pleased to see the choir in the chancel; but all must have felt that the music had lost much of its effectiveness.

At another parish church the new vicar began to arrange for admitting boys into the choir, and moved the singers from the west gallery to the chancel. But, for reasons which it is unnecessary to mention, it was impossible to move the organ; and to this day the instrument stands in its old position, where, though very effective for solo-playing, it is almost worse than useless for accompanimental purposes. It might have been thought that the clergyman, when he found that the organ and the choir were often 'at sixes and sevens,' and knew there was hardly the remotest chance of his ever being able to move the organ, would have moved the choir back to the gallery. But he has never done so. He firmly believes that a choir ought to sit nowhere but in the chancel, and, rather than give up the idea, he prefers to have his music badly rendered. At another parish church, where the service is elaborate, the choir, of course, occupy the chancel, and the organ is placed in a chamber near them. But the manner in which the instrument is dealt with is truly hideous. The organ is closed on two sides by walls, and on the remaining sides egress of the sound is prevented by the front pipes and a number of very low and narrow arches with solid masonry between them. Inside the 'chamber' it is quite dark, and the 'din,' when the organ is played, is terrible. The sacrifice of this organ is all the more to be regretted as it is a very fine instrument.

These examples are not given because such things have never been heard of before. Unhappily it often happens that organs are sacrificed because some clergymen lay greater stress on unessentials than on having good music.* It is not meant

* Moving an organ from the gallery is rarely *necessary*. But if the west wall of a church were incurably damp, or the church were very low

that, when we see a choir in the chancel of a church we are to be sure that ritualistic influences are working at that church. Doubtless many clergymen have had their choirs placed in he chancel and their organs 'brought down,' simply because they wished to follow the fashion. If we knew to what extent the clergy are influenced by the love of pomp and spectacle, ritualism, and a sensuous worship, and to what extent by the desire to follow new ways and be 'in fashion,' when they choose the chancel as the position for the choir, the knowledge would be most valuable, because in most cases the plainest demonstration would not cause clergymen to give up any point held by their school. An attempt to convince a clergyman, who insisted on his choir being surpliced and sitting in the chancel, that his organ would tell much better and gain greatly in quality of tone if it were taken out of a hole and placed in a west gallery, would almost certainly fail.

Before proceeding to consider the advantages of the west gallery as the situation for an organ, it may be well to state some of the general principles that ought to guide us when we have to choose a place for a church organ. The choice of a situation is of great importance, for a small organ, well placed, may be as effective as a large one badly placed—a fact of some importance from a pecuniary point of view; and the effect of a fine organ in a good situation is much grander, more musical,

in proportion to its area, and the organ consequently were pushed up close to the roof, these two conditions, either of them a source of mischief, would combine to derange the action and damage the wind-producing and distributing portions of the instrument, and throw it out of tune. It would be desirable to move the organ to another part of the church. Such cases, however, must be quite exceptional, and the difficulties supposed cannot present themselves at many churches. Seldom can it be necessary to move an organ, unless to bring it near a chancel choir; and all experience shows that the removal of a choir and organ from the gallery to the chancel is almost always detrimental to the effectiveness of the church music. It would be better for a musical congregation to throw their money out of the window, than support a scheme which, while it commended itself to those who thought to improve on old-fashioned ways, would, if carried out, be regretted by all who were able to appreciate good music.

and in every respect more satisfactory than the effect of the same organ if unfavourably situated. Situation affects both the power of an organ and the quality of its tone.

The organ and the singers should be near one another. If they are not, the vocal and the organ tones will be heard separately by those who occupy seats near either, and not be heard united and blended except by people at a considerable distance from both. The congregation should not be between the organ and the choir,* but the choir should be between the organ and the congregation.

In placing an organ and choir, it is important to secure the favourable influence of resonance, and to avoid placing them where their tones will be obstructed or absorbed. (Unfavourable reflection, in the form of excessive reverberation and echo, is not likely to be met with at a parish church in a degree that would be unpleasant to the musicians or detrimental to the music.) Resonance is secured by placing the organ and choir where there is ample free space above and around them; by placing the organ on a platform of resonant wood, which, capable of entering into vibratory movement, performs in a measure the same office for it that the body of a violin or the sound-board of a pianoforte performs for the strings, or a table performs for the tuning-fork placed on it; and by allowing ample area for the organ. It is increased by reflection from roofs and walls and elastic surfaces generally (especially ceilings and walls lined with boardings of thin, well-seasoned wood), and by hollow, empty spaces above the ceiling or below the floor. The response of the string to the note sung into the piano, of the tuning-fork to another precisely in unison with it, and of a column of air of a certain length to the tuning-fork held over it, are examples which show how *particular sounds* are strengthened by musical bodies entering into sympathetic vibration with them. But contrivances for the reinforcement of particular sounds could not be introduced into churches, though the *echeia* furnish an

* The absurdity of this arrangement appears, if we imagine a concert-room with the organ and orchestra at one end, the chorus and solo-singers at the other, and the audience in the middle.

ancient example of the use of columns of air for such a purpose. In the Greek theatres, where the plays were declaimed in a species of recitative, were placed hollow vessels, or vases, tuned to different notes, and these, entering into sympathetic vibration, must have helped the performers' voices, though to what extent we cannot conjecture. In the larger theatres the *echeia* were numerous, and placed in three rows at different elevations (corresponding with the number of *genera* in the Greek musical system). There seems to have been a set of *echeia* for each *genus*. Some have thought that this Greek contrivance might be introduced at churches where the services are intoned, with the effect of increasing the resonance and strengthening the clergyman's voice. It is impossible to question the reasonableness of the suggestion, but difficult to imagine where such singular auxiliaries could be placed so as to be effective and yet unseen. It is unnecessary to dwell on the desirableness of promoting resonance, or the happy effects this excellent property has on both vocal and instrumental music. But a degree of resonance that would be favourable to music might be detrimental to speaking or reading. Whilst a considerable degree of resonance would be favourable to singing or intoning, it would be disadvantageous to the clergyman, by impairing the distinctness of his speaking-voice. The choirs of cathedrals are sonorous, and therefore excellent for the performance of the choral service; but clergymen preaching therein find it difficult to make themselves distinctly heard. This suggests the idea that in churches the clergymen and the musicians should occupy different parts of the building. However many auxiliaries were employed, it would hardly be possible to create in a church a degree of resonance that would be unfavourable to music. If excessive resonance *were* created, this would be a good fault, and might easily be cured by the use of absorbents. Indeed, the presence of the congregation would be enough to neutralize any excess of resonance.

Although free, unoccupied space about the organ and choir is good and necessary (because it conduces to resonance), yet if the vacant space above and behind the musicians were too great, some of the tone would be absorbed, or wasted. Soft,

non-elastic surfaces (as carpets, hassocks, and people's clothing) also absorb sound, and render it dead and dull. The neighbourhood of them is therefore detrimental to music. As they also tend to tone down reverberation and echo, non-elastic surfaces may, however, help the clergyman by rendering speaking easier. And this seems to suggest another reason why the clergymen and the musicians should occupy different parts of the church.

Arresting the onward progress of the sound-waves, and unfavourable to the enjoyment of music, are all obstructions between the musicians and the congregation. An organ and choir ought to be so placed that there shall be as few obstacles as possible between them and the congregation. We should think it a foolish thing to place a screen between the fire and a person who wished to warm himself, or to cut off the direct rays of light from the book we were reading by interposing an opaque object between it and the lamp. And yet an absurdity similar in kind, though not equal to it in degree, is committed when a church organ is so placed that more than half the congregation are in the acoustic shadow.

The best situation for a church organ and choir is the west gallery, but if the choir *must* sit in the chancel, it will be necessary to find as good a place as we can near it for the organ. In many churches the east end of the aisle would then be the best place for it. The organ in this position would not tell as well as it would in the gallery; but if ample area were allowed it, and it were built on a platform, if the aisle were lofty, and everything were favourable to the egress of its tone, the instrument would tell well. But it seldom happens that all the favourable conditions just postulated are granted. Sufficient area and height are not always at the command of the organ-builder, and perhaps there are obstructions in the form of troublesome arches or pillars. Consequently organs erected in this situation are often more or less confined and crowded—much to their detriment—or there is not sufficient egress for their tone. But if the effectiveness of organs that occupy a comparatively favourable situation, such as the end of an aisle, is sometimes impaired, how poor is the

effect of instruments when placed in the 'dismal holes and corners' where we sometimes find them! Though the builder put forth his utmost ingenuity, though he try every possible measure to promote resonance, an organ will not be effective if its tones have to travel round corners before they reach the congregation, or force their way through arches filled up with front pipes, or if it is crowded, or if there are absorbents near it. The recesses into which the 'king of instruments' is sometimes packed are like so many great *sourdines*, which both keep in the power of the instrument and alter the quality of its tone. An organ placed in such a position is smothered.

A correspondent of the *Musical Standard*, writing on the subject of that modern abomination, the 'organ chamber,' well said, 'Formerly [when organs stood in galleries] the tone was allowed to *float* out; now, the organ is put into the "organ-cellar," and the tone must be *forced* out, the result being that the modern instrument, with its indisputable improvements, is not so *musical* an instrument as many an old one, if left standing in the place it was built for.' Dr. Pole, speaking at a meeting of the Musical Association in 1886, said: 'My experience with organ-chambers is rather unfortunate. Having in my young days a good deal to do with organs, I once undertook to superintend the making of an organ for a new church. It was built by Hill; it was on a proper church scale, and was as good an organ as could possibly be; but when it went into the church it was put into an organ-chamber, and the tone was so lost that it was not like the same instrument.' At the same meeting the late Sir Frederick Ouseley read a paper, in which he says of organ-chambers: 'Ordinary parish churches and chapels, in many cases, are so constructed that the only available place for the organ is that abomination of modern invention, an organ-chamber. Organs are obliged to be voiced much louder than is consistent with pure tone, in order to make themselves heard at all under such unfavourable conditions; and not only so, but the large sixteen-foot pipes are usually so hidden away behind the instrument that they are scarcely audible in the

church, while the Mixtures seem doubly shrill and strident by contrast; moreover, the mechanism is often inconveniently crowded, causing frequent derangement and cypherings, and the bellows are often injured by damp in so confined a space. I must, once for all, utter my indignant protest against organ-chambers.' Such are the opinions of musicians of great reputation, and the present writer has never heard any respectable musician express his approval of organ-chambers. It is discouraging to find writers in Church papers, when they have to describe a church restoration, speaking of 'the chamber which has been built for the organ' in terms which make one think that they approve of such structures.

In order to meet the demands of modern fashion, which requires that the choir shall occupy the chancel, other plans for dealing with the organ have been proposed and adopted, besides placing it in a chamber or at the end of an aisle. Some would divide organs, and have one portion placed on each side of the chancel, tubular pneumatic action being used to connect the sound-producing parts of the organ with the player, who would sit near or among the choir at a console (the part of the organ where the keys and stops are), which might be placed where he could best hear the singers, and judge the amount of organ-tone he was employing.* Others, in the case of a very large church, would put the organ into the transept, or, cathedral fashion, on a choir screen; others would build the organ behind and over the Communion Table†; and some would place it in the west gallery, but have the keys in the chancel, the connection being by electric or tubular action. And some have even proposed (in imitation of the arrangements in very large foreign Roman Catholic churches and cathedrals) to have in large churches two organs —a large one in the west gallery, which might be used for

* It is of great importance that the organist be placed where he can hear the choir and congregation well, and judge the amount of power he is employing, without, however, being exposed to the full force of the instrument.

† Organs may be 'bracketed out' in any part of the church, and the keys be on the floor.

grand effects, Voluntary playing, and accompanying the congregation when they sang hymns; and a small one in the chancel, which might be used for accompanying the choir. They would have both organs played by an organist who would sit at a console placed in the chancel. The connection would be either electric or tubular.* Now, even if the chancel were as good a situation (musically) for the choir as the west end gallery, all these plans for dealing with the organ are open to objections from which the gallery position is free. The divided chancel organ would be costly, and in that situation the organ would probably be a little wanting in mellowness and musical effect. The transept organ, if the church were very large, and the organ could be placed so as to be heard well in the body of the church, might probably be more satisfactory. The organ on the screen would have plenty of free space around it, and its tone would be mellow and very musical. Indeed, for the organ of a very large church, considered merely as a solo instrument, this situation would be excellent. But the instrument would be between the choir and the congregation. And the situation, though the very best for the organ of a cathedral (where Divine Service is performed in the choir), is not suitable for a parish church organ. The organ above and behind the Communion Table would be free from this fault; but the position will probably not recommend itself to many people. The action required to enable a west gallery organ to be played by a performer in the chancel would be very expensive. And although the response of pipe to key would be practically instantaneous, the transmission of sound from the gallery to the chancel would take an appreciable interval of time. It would be extremely difficult for most organists (and quite impossible for some), if they sat so far from their instruments, either to play a voluntary or to accompany the singing. Nor would the effect be satisfactory to the congregation, who would be placed between the organ and the choir. The proposal to have two organs—one at each

* Electrical engineering has been brought to such perfection, that an ingenious gentleman has contrived a kind of movable console, which the performer may place in any part of the church.

end of the church—though suiting the Roman Catholic form of service, seems most unlikely to be adopted in our churches; and to control both organs at once would be such a feat as few men could accomplish. But it will not be necessary to criticise all the schemes ingenious men and clever architects have put forth in order to meet the difficulties that almost always arise when a church choir is removed from the west gallery. Suffice it to say, that to place an organ so that it shall tell well and sound mellow, and be effective for Voluntary playing, leading the congregation, and accompanying a *chancel* choir, and to find a good place for the organist, where he may hear the organ, choir, and congregation, be in touch with the choir, and see the clergyman—to do this and not spoil their building is, and must remain, a puzzling problem for our architects to solve, even when the funds admit of the application of electric or tubular actions. And all this difficulty has arisen, vast sums of money have been spent, many organs have been placed in unfavourable positions, and Church music has lost much of its effectiveness, simply because some people believe that a choir should sit nowhere but in the chancel. If it were desired at any very large church to have a surpliced chancel choir, which should render the service, while the congregation took part in singing the hymns, surely it would be better to have only *one organ*, in the west gallery, with an organist in the gallery to play it, and *two choirs*, one of women and men's voices in the gallery, the other of surpliced boys and men in the chancel. The chancel choir might render the response-singing without accompaniment, and the gallery choir might chant the Psalms, and sing the service-music (canticles) and the anthem, with the accompaniment of the organ. If the congregation joined in the hymn-singing, they might be led by the gallery choir and the organ. The organ would be in the best situation possible for Voluntary-playing.* Of all the schemes for dealing with the organ and

* The necessity of having two choirs seems to be the only fault in this scheme, which, it is believed, is a novel one. When the writer asked an eminent organist how he would like to have two choirs at his church, he received the reply: 'One is quite trouble enough.'

the position of the organist's seat when there *must* be a surpliced chancel choir, the writer ventures to think this is the most free from fault. It provides an organ and a choir to render the chief choral portions of the service, and lead the congregational singing, and places them in the best situation possible. It requires no tubular or electric action (thus saving much money), and places the organist in an excellent position with regard to his organ and choir. And it admits of a surpliced chancel choir to make the responses after the minister. It thus provides a surpliced chancel choir, and satisfies the requirements of modern ritual, and at the same time retains the west gallery, with its many advantages, for the organ and singers.

Whatever the ecclesiastical reason for placing the choir in the chancel may be worth, it is certain that our ancestors knew very well what they were about when they chose the west gallery as the place for the organ and the choir. The old-fashioned plan of placing the organist with his instrument and choir in the gallery was practical, easy, and satisfactory from every point of view (except, of course, the 'ritualistic'); and it required no separate consoles and expensive mechanisms. Let us look at some facts which make greatly in favour of the gallery position. The gallery might be made of considerable size, and ample area could be given to the organ. Consequently there need be no crowding of the pipes or mechanism; the passage-boards might be made wider than they generally are; there would not be the difficulty of getting about the organ—so great in crowded organs—for the purpose of regulating or repairing; and the sound-boards might be made of ample size, a consideration of great importance. The empty space within the organ would have a good effect on the organ tone, by increasing resonance. Dr. Hopkins remarks (Rimbault and Hopkins, 'History and Construction of the Organ,' p. 290): 'It can never be correctly said that unoccupied space in an organ within reason is lost room, since, next to the pipes themselves, which are, of course, necessary to emit the primary sounds, free air is the most important element in the production of a resonant quality of tone. It is, indeed,

true that English organ-builders have frequently been called upon to "get in" a great number of stops into an unreasonably small space, and one cannot help admiring the manner in which they have frequently grappled with the difficulties which have beset them; at the same time, England is in consequence by no means destitute of organs that are nearly as crowded, and almost as destitute of resonance, as a broker's shop. It is a fact always worth the remembrance of those who would limit an organ-builder too strictly in regard to space, that one of the secrets of the good effect of many old instruments is their *comparative emptiness.* They have not only pipes to produce tone, but breathing room to improve it.' But there would not only be unoccupied space *within* the organ, but also ample free space around and above it; and this also would have a favourable influence on the tone, which would sound free and mellow, which can never be the case when an organ is confined and lacks head-room. The elevated position of the organ would be advantageous, for its tone would be improved as it descended, the different kinds of stops and qualities of tone blending into one harmonious whole. Other advantages would be secured by placing the organ in the west gallery. 'The full force of the instrument would pass over, instead of overwhelming those nearest to it, into the open space before it, whence it would be diffused throughout the edifice.' Almost every person in the church would get an uninterrupted ray of sound. The initial impulse would be in the direction of the congregation, and the gallery being at the end of the church, the back wall of which would act as a reflector, the sound would be equally dispersed throughout the church, spreading 'somewhat after the manner of the rays of light through the bull's-eye of a lantern,' which could not be the case if the organ were placed at the side of the church. The resonant wooden gallery would have a most beneficial effect on the tone of the organ, and there would be no absorbents near to damp it.

But if the gallery is the best situation for the organ, the choir also would be heard to the greatest advantage if placed therein. If it is necessary that the clergyman occupy a raised

position in order that he may be heard throughout the church, it is for the same reason necessary to elevate the choir. If the choir occupied the gallery, the initial impulse would be directly towards the congregation, and the effect of the singing would be better than it can be when the singers are placed in rows at a right angle to the congregation.

Another argument for the gallery is drawn from the fact that singers placed there would not be seen—a fact worthy the attention of those who, while preferring female voices to boys', have adopted mediæval opinions, or dislike to see feathers and ribbons in the chancel. There can be only one objection (to be mentioned presently) to placing the choir where they are not seen. Everything seems to point to the desirableness of choosing such a position for the choir and organist. In the gallery the organist could communicate with the choir without being perceived, and the singers would find their places and turn over their leaves unseen. Moreover, the concealed position would be a comfort and a help to singers who suffered from 'nervousness.' Except when he is required to wear a surplice, and it is deemed a matter of paramount importance that people know it, it cannot be needful for the organist to be exposed to the gaze of the congregation. In the gallery his movements would not be seen. For his own comfort and the congregation's, the organist is better concealed, especially if he has a certain ludicrous habit. The writer once attended service at a church where the organist 'rolled' very heavily. This gentleman was a good player, but a very tall, thin man, with a large head and very bushy hair and whiskers. As the organ was at the end of the aisle and he sat at the west side of it with his back towards the congregation, and no screen whatever was allowed him, it was impossible not to notice his oscillations, and think how like he was to a great metronome.*

* It is surely very important to secure such a position for the musicians that the blowing, the manipulating, pedalling, stop-shifting, and rolling of the organist, the turning-over of leaves and finding of places, the signalling and whispering—all of which are more or less distracting to the worshipper—shall be done out of sight.

It may, perhaps, be objected that if the singers were placed where they were not seen, some of them might be tempted to behave with levity; and that this would not only be highly improper in itself, but also very annoying to the clergyman, who would see the misconduct without being able to stop it. But it may be replied that if the organist and clergyman together determined to put a stop to such irregularities, they ought surely to be able to do so.

From his elevated position the organist would hear the congregation fairly well, and, by means of a glass, see the clergyman. He would be well in touch with the choir. It may be pointed out in favour of the gallery, that if a performance of oratorio were given in the church, the vocal and instrumental forces and the conductor would not be seen by the congregation. It is also worthy of remark that if the organ and choir were placed in the gallery, more sittings would be gained to the church—a matter of great importance sometimes.

If, as has been said, a fine organ in the gallery would 'come out grandly,' and a choir be heard to advantage, the effect of the singing and accompaniment combined, mellowing and blending as they descended, could not fail to be extremely beautiful.

Of the above arguments for the old-fashioned gallery some are weighty, and some are of less importance. When they are all taken together, the force of them is very considerable. And it does not weaken the conclusion arrived at, when one remembers that the west gallery position is still retained on the Continent, and has been abandoned in English churches chiefly because it did not satisfy some exploded ecclesiastical theories.* A west gallery for a large parish church, in which

* The west gallery approved itself to the good judgment of our ancestors as emphatically *the* place for the organ and musicians. In many of the finest London churches the organ still occupies the old position, and parish church organs and choirs on the Continent are, almost without exception, in the gallery. The traveller visiting foreign countries (Protestant or Roman Catholic) seldom sees the organ standing elsewhere than in the gallery. If the west gallery were not the best situation for the organ, a musical people like the Germans, we may be quite sure, would

it was proposed to erect a fine organ, probably should not be less than 30 feet wide by 25 feet deep. And if there were a probability of performances of oratorio being given at the church, it would have to be still deeper.

A gallery 30 feet by 25 feet would be ample for a three-manual organ of thirty-five sounding-stops (including a pedal of six stops—four of them being of 16 feet—a Double Open Diapason on the Great Organ, and a double reed on the Swell) and a choir of forty voices. The organ would stand 7 feet 6 inches from the front of the gallery. A space 4 feet wide, from the organ-seat to the front of the gallery, would divide the choir into two equal parts, which might sing antiphonally. The floor of the front seat would be 12 feet above the floor of the church, that of the second seat 6 inches higher, and the rest of the gallery would be raised another foot. So that the organ would stand 13 feet 6 inches above the floor of the church. If the church were 45 feet high from the floor to the horizontal beams which support the roof, and 60 feet from the floor to the apex of the roof, the top of the Pedal Open Diapason would be about 15 feet from the beams and 30 feet from the apex. Above the top of the swell-box (which would be made roomy and lofty) there would be 13 feet to the beams and 28 feet to the apex. The top of the longest pipe of the Double Open Diapason (which would be carried down in metal) would be some 6 feet from the beams and 21 feet from the apex. So that there would be plenty of unoccupied space above, as well as around the organ.*

not have retained it. But though the organ and choir still keep their time-honoured position abroad, we find English Churchmen a quarter of a century ago commencing to bring them down from the gallery. And this singular departure from the old custom seems to have resulted from the Puseyite movement. In churches where 'ritualistic' influence prevails, we invariably find a surpliced chancel choir with an organ placed near it.

* If the church were only—say 30 feet high to the beams, and 40 feet to the apex of the roof, and it were desirable to have a Double Open Diapason on the Great Organ, some of the lowest notes might be of stopped wood. Perhaps this stop might be carried down in metal as far as the FFF of 12 feet theoretical length. But the longest pipe would rise 4 or

If the gallery were made 5 feet deeper, another pew (making three in all on each side of the central passage) might be added; and if an oratorio were given, the solo singers might be placed in it. The second and third pews and a portion of the space between the third pew and the organ (5 feet) and chairs placed on each side of the organ (within view of the conductor) would seat a chorus of about sixty. A band of some fourteen stringed instruments might occupy the remaining portion of the space on each side of the organ-seat and part of the central passage. If the conductor stood against the front of the gallery and were elevated a few inches, and the floor were arranged like that of an orchestra, he would be seen by the whole vocal and instrumental force. The floor of the first pew would be 12 feet above the floor of the church, that of the second 6 inches higher, and that of the third 6 inches higher again. Half of the space between the back seat and the organ would be raised 6 inches higher still, while the remainder of that space and the organ itself would be raised another foot. The floor on which the organ would stand would therefore be 14 feet 6 inches above the floor of the church. As the instrument would stand 12 feet 6 inches from the front of the gallery, it would be well to raise the swell, and perhaps the pedal sound-boards, 2 feet.

For a smaller church a gallery of less size would be required. But whatever its dimensions, the front of the gallery should be made of thin wood and kept low; 3 feet 6 inches would be high enough. All the wood used in the construction of the gallery should be very dry and well seasoned, and in as long lengths as can be procured.

In the above scheme the gallery is kept as low as possible, partly because the intensity of sound is influenced by the density of the air at the place where the sound is produced (the lighter the air, the feebler the sound), and the upper

5 feet above the beams, and be only 5 feet from the apex. But probably the church would not be large enough to require a Double Open; and the longest pipes in the organ would then be the CCC and CC of the Pedal and Great Open Diapasons, the tops of which would be about level with the beams and 10 feet below the apex of the roof.

strata of air in a crowded church are much less dense than the lower, which furnishes a reason why singing (especially solo singing) from a low platform must be more satisfactory than it would be if the singer were more elevated. It is also desirable to secure a sufficient space between the organ and the roof, and guard the organ from changes of temperature both inside and outside the church, which, besides causing disarrangements in the mechanism, would throw the instrument out of tune. Ample height above the organ is also required for the improvement of its tone.

CHAPTER II.

THE ORGAN.

AN organ should be pleasant to play upon and easy to control; its pipes should speak promptly and steadily, and the tone they produce be full, mellow, rich, firm, and characteristic. Further, the playing of the instrument should not be accompanied by any noises in the interior of the organ, though absolute silence is not to be looked for, especially in very new instruments. In other words, the touch should be even, true, and prompt, and not heavy, even when two manuals are coupled together, and the repetition good; the draw-stops should work easily, and the manual and pedal-keys, the draw-stops, and the various movements used in shifting them, should be so placed as to be well under the control of the player. In large instruments there should be additional appliances, prompt in action, to help the player to have full command of the instrument. The bellows should be large enough to give a good supply of wind; the wind-trunks should be roomy, and the wind-chests capacious. The sound-boards, grooves, and pallets, should be of ample size, and every pipe should receive its full and ample share of wind. Every pipe should, when possible, stand on its own wind. The action (finger, pedal, and draw-stop) should be of the best workmanship and contain as few centres as possible. Only good wood and metal should be used for the pipes, which should be voiced by competent artists.

Such improvements have been made in mechanism by ingenious organ-builders within the last few years, that by the application of pneumatics and electricity, and the introduction

of a number of mechanisms quite unknown a few years ago, large organs, formerly rather troublesome to manage, can be played without demanding great physical force, and controlled without trouble. Pneumatic power is frequently employed in modern organs. In some cases it has been used to work all the movements and actions (finger, pedal, draw-stop, couplers, and combination).* Studs placed near the manual keys to effect combinations of stops are becoming not uncommon in church organs.† Quite recently a firm has introduced a valuable system of interchangeable combinational pistons, which register any combination for any length of time without interfering with the independent use of the stops. Great attention is paid to the winding of organs. Improvements have been made in the bellows. In larger organs separate reservoirs for the wind have been introduced. All the stops of a manual are not on the same sound-board and blown with the same pressure of wind, but the stops are blown at different pressures. The importance of having good metal for the pipes is more generally recognised by purchasers of organs than it was some years ago. Indeed the organs now built by our best firms may be pronounced to be in every respect perfect instruments, the only defects in them being the occasional smallness of the pedal organs (necessitated either by want of standing-room for the pipes, or by the costliness of pipes of large size), and the sometimes unsatisfactory quality of their tone (the consequence of placing instruments in unfavourable positions).

The number of stops an organ should have depends on the size of the church, the number of the congregation, the situation the instrument is to occupy, and the acoustical properties (which may be favourable or not) of the building. If placed in a situation where it will be closed in, and its tone stifled, it will need not only more blowing and voicing stronger, but also more stops than it would require if it occupied a good position. The west gallery is suggested (Chapter I.) as the very best

* Pneumatic organs are rapid in speech, and noiseless in action; but they are expensive.

† The combinations of large *pedal* organs are generally managed by composition pedals.

situation for a church organ. The advantage of this position was well known to our ancestors. In Continental churches the organ still stands in the gallery, as it does also in many of the London churches. In concert-halls it occupies a similar position, standing on an elevated platform at the end of the building. (The present craze for demolishing organ galleries and placing choirs and organs in chancels and chambers, it cannot too earnestly be pointed out, is most unfortunate for church organs and church music.) If the acoustical properties of the church were unfavourable, more stops would be required than need be allowed an organ that is to be placed in a church more favourable to sound. As some churches have side-galleries and others have not, it is difficult to decide on the size of an organ from the number of sittings in the church. Sir John Stainer, at a meeting of the Musical Association in 1886, gave 'a very rough-and-ready rule by which you can always find out roughly the cost an organ ought to be by the number of sittings. It ought to be about £1 a head. If you have a church holding five hundred people, and spend £500 on the organ, you will have one large enough for the purpose.' It should be borne in mind that Sir John Stainer himself speaks of this rule as a very rough-and-ready one. A musician knows what size of organ will be required when he sees and tries the church in which it is intended to erect one. If unacquainted with the size, proportions, and properties of the building, he is necessarily unable to say how large the organ ought to be, in order to fill the church with sound and yet not be too powerful.

But be the church big or little, and the organ favourably placed or not, the instrument, whether a large or a small one, must contain, first of all, some stops of 8 feet tone for the manual, and 16 feet tone for the pedal organ, to form a foundation tone, which must predominate. The stops next in importance for the manual are those of 4 feet tone (sounding the octave of the key pressed down), and then those of 2 feet (sounding the double octave). Mutation stops, which sound the twelfth, nineteenth, etc., of the key pressed down, should only be introduced when the organ contains a sufficient number

of 8, 4, and 2 feet stops.* With an organ containing only two Diapasons, a Principal, and a Fifteenth (this latter being voiced delicately) on the manual, and a stop of 16 feet tone on the pedal, the singing of a good number of people might be led, though it could not be accompanied *with effect* on an instrument so poor in resources. While so small an organ might be deemed sufficient for a mission-room, where perhaps a varied, artistic accompaniment is not called for, it would require the addition of some more stops if it were intended to be used in a church. If another row of keys were added, and a Swell Organ containing four stops with the same names as the four important stops played by the first row of keys were created, the organ would be larger and more expensive, but would contain little more variety than the one-manual organ. It would suffice for the support of the singing of the choir and congregation, and produce contrasts of *forte* and *piano*, but no colouring (so necessary in artistic organ playing) could be got from it. If it were desired that the organist should play artistically and render his voluntaries effectively, and introduce an agreeable variety of tone-colouring in Voluntary playing and accompanying the singing, stops of different qualities of tone would be needed. Changes must be made in the little two-manual organ, or new stops must be added: viz., one or two stops of reedy quality, an 8 feet reed, and one or two stops belonging to the flute group. To give dignity and breadth of tone a stop of 16 feet tone must be placed on one of the manuals. A 'Twelfth' stop should be added to the Great Organ, and an Open Diapason of 16 feet to the Pedal.† Should a larger organ be needed, a Mixture and a Trumpet-stop might be added to the Great Organ, and another reed to

* When this rule is neglected (and it often is), the foundation tone does not predominate sufficiently, and the full organ is unsatisfactory.

† The small organ might be re-arranged and enlarged to contain the following stops:

Great Organ: Open Diapason, Stop Diapason, and Dulciana, 8 feet. Principal and Suabe Flute, 4 feet. Twelfth, 2⅔ feet. Fifteenth, 2 feet.

Swell Organ: Bourdon, 16 feet. Spitzflöte, Lieblich Gedackt, and Viola, 8 feet. Gemshorn, 4 feet. Piccolo, 2 feet. Oboe, 8 feet.

Pedal Organ: Open Diapason and Bourdon, 16 feet—an effective little organ containing sixteen sounding-stops in all.

the Swell; also a flute of 8 feet tone to the Pedal.* In this way, the foundation tone and the balance being carefully maintained, the organ grows till at length it contains some eleven stops in the Great Organ, eleven in the Swell, and six in the Pedal, and has also another manual, the Choir Organ, which, containing some eight stops, may be used either in accompanying the singing or for solo purposes. Such an organ, containing three manuals and a pedal, and thirty-six sounding-stops (all of them being good and useful stops, and none of them of the kind used for producing silly, unchurch-like 'effects'), would be powerful enough for a large church, and sufficiently varied, as to tone-colouring, for all legitimate organ-playing.

When it has been settled that the organ shall stand in the west gallery—or, if not in the gallery, in the next best position in the church—and a specification of the stops the instrument should contain, in order to be varied and large enough, but not too powerful for the church, has been drawn up by some competent person (none so good, probably, as the organist of the church), it will be necessary to choose a builder to do the work.† And now the services of the person who prepared the

* In the Pedal Organ stops of 16 feet tone must predominate. Those of 8 feet are next in importance in that department of the organ.

† In drawing up the specification, care would be taken that while the instrument should possess variety, the effect of combinations of stops and of the full organ should be satisfactory, which it often is not. If the reeds were too numerous, or blown at too great a pressure, they would predominate over the flue stops, and drown the pure organ tone, and the full organ would be 'brassy.' If the instrument contained too many flute stops, or flute stops of the wrong kind, or harmonic flutes were incautiously introduced, the tone would be 'hooty.' If there were too many stops of reedy quality, it would not be round and 'velvety.' Among the flue stops (of whatever pitch), the diapason work (by which is meant cylindrical, open, metal stops of open diapason scale) should predominate. If it did not, the organ would lack 'body.' The Swell, as well as the Great Organ, should be perfectly balanced, and quite satisfactory when used alone; and it should be borne in mind, in drawing up the specification, that the two organs, each with its own body and quality of sound, will be coupled to form a full organ.* The fundamental tone must predomi-

* The Choir Organ is seldom used in forming a full organ. It generally consists of only a few 8 and 4 feet flue stops of delicate quality, and one

specification will be very valuable ; for there are builders *and* builders, and when there are so many builders to select from, unprofessional persons will not always choose the best. It is very desirable that the organ committee should be assisted by someone who thoroughly understands organs. For some firms, good enough to rank as second-rate builders, can make good mechanism, but the tone of their organs is not pleasing. Their work, from key to pallet, is fairly well done, but the tone (of the first importance in a musical instrument) is far from good, being shrill and coarse when it should be bright, full, and mellow. Their diapasons are not firm, rich, and sonorous, nor have the different stops sufficient individuality of tone. And there are builders who can neither make a good action (much less a fine one) nor voice pipes. If there were ample funds, the musical adviser of the organ committee, with whom the obtaining of a fine organ would, it may be presumed, be a matter of paramount importance, would probably find it his easiest and best course to send copies of the specification to the best London firms, and ask them to give estimates for the work. If it happened that the estimates were too costly for the committee to entertain, some of those excellent provincial firms who have produced such good work might next be applied to. But great caution should be used in accepting estimates from builders of little or no reputation. Their organs may cost less than those of the leading builders, but they are

nate. There must be a good number of 8 feet, a smaller number of 4 feet, and a still smaller number of 2 feet flue stops. 'Twelfths' and mutation ranks of pipes must be comparatively few in number. The foundation tone must predominate even when the full organ up to the Mixtures is used—that is, it must not be left to the reeds (as is often the case) to maintain it when the full organ is used. The pedal organ, if the instrument is to be of fair size, should contain three 16 feet, and one or two 8 feet, flue stops, as well as a 16 feet reed. To impart dignity, 'double' stops (the pipes of which sound the octave below the note pressed down) should be included in the scheme. A small organ should have a Bourdon of *Lieblich* quality on one of the manuals—a larger instrument will require one of larger scale—and an organ of fairly large size might

or two soft reeds—a Corno di Bassetto, Clarinet, or Cremona, and perhaps a Cor Anglais or Oboe.

not likely to be so good and durable. Cheaply-made organs, and organs made by men whose great aim is to gain as much money as possible by their business, soon prove troublesome. They are continually needing repair, and sometimes even collapse altogether, after a few years' service. Moreover, the tone produced by pipes made of poor metal, and badly voiced, is greatly inferior to the tone of the pipes a first-rate builder makes for his organs, and an imperfect action is very unsatisfactory for many reasons. Cheap organs, it has been said, are not durable; but a really good and well-built organ, if placed where it would be free from damp, draught, and sources of heat, and properly cared for, would serve for many generations of parishioners, reasonable wear and tear allowed for. Rather than order a large organ of inferior quality, it is better to have a smaller one made by a first-rate builder. A few good stops make better music than a great number of poor ones; and it is better, when sufficient funds are not immediately forthcoming, to leave out the *pipes* of some of the stops, or, in other words, to have so many 'blank slides.' The pipes (always expensive, if made, as they should be, of good metal) might be put in as soon as the money to purchase them was raised. If an organ committee *will* 'have a deal for their money,' they may perhaps succeed in beating some builder down in price, and getting a large organ for a comparatively small price. But they must not be angry with the builder if the instrument in a few years begins to fail, or breaks down altogether. They *would* have a cheap organ, and they must make the best of their bargain. Dr. Hopkins remarks: 'Will the organ [if the builder has been prevailed on to lower his price] when completed, rank as highly *as a work of art* as it was originally intended by its designer it should do? Will it reflect more than *temporary* credit on its builder? A few years pass, and *the organ itself* probably solves these problems. And, as though to reduce its existence to the shortest span, the crowded organ has perhaps been consigned to a site

have an open metal stop of 16 feet on the Great Organ, as well as a Bourdon on the Swell. A Pedal Organ of ten stops should contain an Open Diapason of 32 feet, or at least a Sub-bass of 32 feet tone.

bounded by cold or damp walls, where the leather-work has quickly rotted, the brass-work corroded, the iron-work rusted, the glue soddened, and the accurate adjustment of the several parts of the wood-work, by swelling, been disturbed. Crooked or bruised metal pipes, cracked wooden pipes, running sound-boards, twisted rollers, double frictional resistance opposed to the fingers at the keys, and numerous other such fatalities, too frequently indicate what are and must ever be among the most probable distinctivenesses of the "cheap organ." Nor is the builder exactly to be held responsible for all this if he gave timely advice and warning.' (Rimbault and Hopkins, 'The Organ,' p. 304.) In matters connected with organ-building, amateurs are liable to be misled by appearances. They see an imposing array of stop-handles, or read on paper a long list of stops, or perhaps they note with satisfaction that the organ contains a very great number of pipes. But these things are not always an index to the size and quality of an organ. Of the numerous stops some may be incomplete (without pipes in the bass), and some may be half-stops (being managed by two knobs instead of only one). Mixture stops may be divided in order to get a larger number of draw-stops; the most important stops, as the diapasons and pedal stops (which are also the most costly), may be few in number; and the organ may contain an excessive number of small and inexpensive stops. In order to get a great number of pipes, a great number of chorus stops (the pipes of which are short and inexpensive) may be introduced, and the organ may contain sadly too few of the longer and more important pipes.* Or some of the pipes may be made of inferior metal, or of a different kind of metal. The long pipes of stops, which should be of metal throughout, may be of the cheaper material, wood; or the basses of stops which should extend throughout a manual, may be wanting, and borrowed from other stops of similar quality by grooving or other means. Or whole stops may be borrowed. These artifices, it may be said, are sometimes so cleverly managed that it is hardly possible to detect

* In which case it will want balance, and the foundation tone will not predominate.

the omission, except by counting the pipes of each stop. All this shows that, in some cases, the help of a competent person may be very useful to an organ committee. It will, in the end, be found the truest economy to employ a first-rate builder to erect the organ. If his terms seem high, it must be remembered that he has a high reputation to maintain, and dare not, even if he wished, turn out work that would bring him discredit. The organ he will erect will be made of the best material, will be well finished, will please everyone by its beauty of tone, and will be durable. As the maker of fine astronomical instruments deserves as much honour as the discoverer who benefits by his skill and inventive power, so the builder of fine organs is entitled to share our respect with the accomplished organist who owes so much to his skill.

In 'restoring' an organ it will generally be desirable to have new wind-chests and a new action, also new bellows. Indeed, almost everything, probably, ought to be new—except the pipes, which, perhaps, might be worth retaining. In many cases it would be better to sell the old organ, and let the new organ be, indeed, a new one throughout. Dr. Rimbault has preserved a characteristic story of Snetzler. When the churchwardens of Lynn asked this eminent builder what their old organ would be worth if repaired, he told them that 'if they would lay out a hundred pounds upon it, perhaps it would be worth fifty.' (Rimbault and Hopkins, 'The Organ,' p. 148.)

If a firm of high reputation were employed to build the organ, confidence might be placed in them; and, as such a firm must understand their business better than anyone else, the less they were interfered with, the better for the organ. But if the work were placed in the hands of an inferior builder, the quality of the metal to be used for the pipes, the scale of some of the principal stops, the kind of wood to be used for certain parts of the organ, and sundry other particulars, should be stated in his estimate. It should be agreed that the bellows shall be double-feeding and double-leathered, and have silent valves and regulators, and that they shall give a steady and equal pressure at all stages of inflation, and con-

tinue to give an ample supply of wind when the full organ is used; that the wind-trunks shall be roomy, short, and direct, and the wind-chests capacious (or, if necessary, that separate reservoirs shall be made), and that the pipes shall be steadily winded; that there shall be no robbing (of wind), but each pipe shall have an ample supply—the sound-boards being large, with deep grooves and large pallets and pallet-holes, or double grooves in the bass of the Great and Swell organs. If, as is desirable in all but small organs, the reed-stops are to have a separate sound-board, and be blown by a heavier wind, this should be stated. It should be agreed, further, that the sound-boards shall be large, and as many pipes as possible stand on their own wind, and that long conveyances shall not be used for the front pipes, but these pipes have a sound-board of their own. The agreement should state, further, that the tables, sliders, and bearers of the sound-boards shall be made of mahogany; that the touch shall be light, even, and true, and the repetition satisfactory—relief-pallets of some kind being used for the Great and Swell organs of instruments of middling size, and in larger instruments the pneumatic lever or tubular pneumatic action.* (The manual organs, whether large or small, if the keys are far from the pipes, and in every case the Pedal organ, even though it should be of the smallest, should be built on the tubular pneumatic system: which insures prompt response when the keys are pressed down, and silence the instant the hands or feet quit them.) It should also be agreed that iron rollers shall be used; that the action (finger, pedal, and draw-stop) shall be silent; that the draw-stops shall work easily, and the couplers be free from friction; that the swell-box shall be very roomy, and contain all the pipes belonging to the Swell organ, and the wood of which it is made be at least 2 inches thick—or 2½ inches if the organ is a large one; and that all the wood used in the construction of the organ shall be well seasoned, the workmanship of the first order, and all the action-work carefully

* In a large three-manual organ probably the pneumatic lever would be applied to the Great and Swell and couplers, and tubular action to the Pedal Organ.

finished in every detail. Whoever may build the organ, it might be stated in the agreement that the work shall be done to the satisfaction of some competent judge, who would know how to test it.

The organ should, if small, have a neat appearance; if large, it should look imposing. There can be no necessity for making an organ look tawdry, mean, or ugly, or giving it the appearance of a great four-poster bed. If the funds will admit of the organ having a case above the impost, it should harmonize in style with the church, and in colour with the rest of the wood-work. If placed in a west gallery, this harmony with the surroundings in style and colour would, perhaps, not be so important, and the case then might be of dark wood. Whatever the style, the case should not prevent the tone of the pipes from making its way into the church. Better no case than one by which the pipes are stifled as in a great box. The front pipes, instead of being arranged in an unbroken flat, may be grouped in flats and towers, and their tops may be concealed by some carved wood-work. They may be plain, gilt, or diapered. If painted all kinds of tints, which harmonize neither with one another nor with anything in the building, their appearance will be more striking than pleasing. If well gilded, front pipes have a beautiful appearance; and if slightly diapered, they look exquisite. A front of plain metal, if the metal contains a large percentage of tin, has a fine silvery appearance. Unfortunately, tin is dear, and as metal of poor quality is cheap, fronts of dull, leaden-looking metal are more common than fronts of tin or fine spotted metal. Front pipes are sometimes made of inferior metal, and gilded. But if gilded pipes of poor metal were as handsome, they could not produce as good a tone as pipes of fine metal. A front of well-gilded pipes of fine metal would satisfy both those who like gilt pipes and those who insist on fine quality of tone; but if it were a 16 feet front, it would be so costly that one would not venture to suggest it. Zinc is often used for long metal pipes to save expense, and fronts are made of it. But though large pipes of zinc give a good tone, zinc fronts have not a beautiful appearance. The gray colour of the

metal is not pleasing to the eye. Perhaps zinc pipes would look better if they were suitably decorated. The pipes generally used for fronts are the Double Open Diapason and the Open Diapason in the Great Organ, and the Violone (metal) and the Open Diapason (metal) in the Pedal Organ. If a small organ, with no longer metal pipes than the Open Diapason of 8 feet, must have two fronts, the second might be of wooden pipes nicely decorated. The west gallery organ needs but one front, and this should be very handsome.

In suggesting that a first-rate builder should be employed to construct and erect the organ, the writer stated that a really good organ, if free from damp, draught, and sources of heat, and properly cared for, would serve for many generations of parishioners. By properly caring for the instrument is not meant inconsiderately depriving the organist of a source of income by refusing to allow him to give lessons, and his pupils to practise on it, which uses of the instrument can in no way be injurious to it: though the opinion has begun to grow in certain quarters that a church organ should not be used for teaching purposes, and no one should practise thereon but some few privileged persons. The choice of a dry place for the organ (and bellows) is most important. If an organ is put up where there is damp or draught, it will certainly take cold and wheeze, or become asthmatic and gasp for breath, or it will grow stiff with rheumatism. It will not be long before it is unfit for work. The effects of heat (often felt when an organ is too near a roof, on which the sun's rays pour in summer) show themselves chiefly in the deranged mechanism of the instrument.

The pitch of a church organ should not be too high. Perhaps a pitch of C = 512 vibrations is the best. This pitch, being about a semitone below concert pitch, suits choirs and congregations well. It does well for Handel's music and the music of the eighteenth century generally, also for the compositions of the present time. But it would be found too low for wind-instruments, if such were required to take part in a performance of oratorio in the church. A pitch of C = 528, which is only a third of a semitone below concert pitch, and

not quite half a semitone above the pitch suggested, would suit them better. Another pitch to which organs are sometimes tuned is the French normal diapason, which is half-way between the two mentioned. But the low pitch (C=512) seems to be quite the best, inasmuch as it suits the voices better than a higher pitch would; and it is surely wiser to consult the convenience of the congregation and choir, who are singing weekly, perhaps daily, to the organ, than the wind instruments, which in few churches are used more than once or twice a year, and in most churches never. It may be added, that while a band of stringed instruments is required for a performance of oratorio, the wind instruments are not so indispensable when there is a good organ.

Till recently organs were so tuned that some keys were in such good tune that they 'flowed like oil'; but (the number of sounds in an octave being much greater than the number of notes on a keyed instrument) the rest of the keys were necessarily painfully out of tune. This system of tuning was called Unequal Temperament. While it was evidently unsuited to concert-hall organs (which must play in all keys), many have thought that Unequal Temperament might have been retained for *church* organs, which, by a little management on the part of the organist, may avoid playing in the bad keys, except, indeed, in some anthems and organ-pieces, which while generally in a favourable key, modulate more or less frequently into keys that on an organ tuned to Unequal Temperament are out of tune. The late Dr. Wesley long upheld the old system of tuning and opposed the new, the (so-called) Equal Temperament, in which every key is slightly out of tune, and not one chord can be played that is perfectly in tune. One result of the introduction of the present system of tuning has been a radical change in the composition of Mixture stops; Tierces (ranks of pipes sounding a third above the double octave) to which the old Sesquialtera owed so much, being so offensive on an equally tempered organ that they are always omitted in modern Mixtures. But whatever may be the merits and faults of the two systems of tuning, it is useless to discuss them here. The tuner will certainly tune

the organ to Equal Temperament, even though the instrument be required only to accompany the simplest psalmody.

Not only should the organ be of suitable size, but its pipes should be scaled and voiced to suit the church, and the situation the instrument is intended to occupy. Some organs are so unfavourably situated that every means has to be tried in order to render them powerful enough for the building, and the organ-tone, instead of being full and mellow, is often harsh and piercing. But if it is happily resolved to place the instrument in a favourable situation, there can be no need for either a monster organ or an overblown one. In a large church the reeds of the Great and Pedal organs might, to their improvement, be put on a wind an inch higher than the flue stops; and if the organ of a very large church had no Solo organ, a second 8 feet reed might be placed on the Great organ and blown at a high pressure.* As a general rule the Great and Pedal organs should be well blown up, and pipes of large scale used in these two departments of the organ. The scaling of the pipes would vary according to the size of the church. The longest pipe of the Great Organ Open Diapason for a small church might be only 5 inches in diameter; but for a large church the diameter of the same pipe might be 6 or 7 inches. The block of the CCC pipe of the wood Pedal Open Diapason for a church of medium size might measure 10×12 inches, or an inch more each way; but for a large church 12×14 inches, or even an inch or two more.

It has been said that good metal—that is, metal containing a good proportion of tin and only a small proportion of lead—is expensive. An organ with pipes of good metal costs considerably more than one with pipes that are composed chiefly of lead. But though good metal is costly, it is so much superior to poor metal as material for organ pipes, that the extra cost of it should not prevent its being used. Pipes of good metal produce a much finer quality of tone than can be

* Except in the case of tubas, the pressure for the reeds (even in a building of the very largest size) should probably never exceed 5 inches. If the reeds are either too numerous or overblown, the instrument will sound more like a brass band than an organ.

got from poor metal, and securing a fine quality of tone is a thing of the *first* importance in organ-building. Though expensive to purchase, pipes of good metal prove eventually the cheapest, for they are very durable. They will last a very long time—even hundreds of years. Another excellent property of good metal is that pipes made of it are hardly affected by changes of temperature, which is equivalent to saying they keep well in tune. 'Spotted metal' is much used, and is highly valued as material for pipes. But there are different qualities of it, from the finest, which contains a high percentage of tin, to the poorest, which contains much less of the organ-builder's precious metal. As 'spotted metal' is a somewhat vague term, it may be well to say that all the metal pipes of 6 feet length and under (or if there were ample funds at disposal, all down to 8 feet) should be made of *fine* spotted metal, that for the diapasons being of good thickness. The 8 feet metal flue stops of the Choir Organ (the Gamba especially) should be of almost pure tin.* To save expense, the longer metal pipes are often made of zinc, which is cheap, stands well in tune, and answers very well for 16 feet Pedal Open Diapasons and Violones and the basses of Great Organ Double Open Diapasons. Some good basses to the manual Open Diapasons have been made of zinc, when it has been necessary to study great economy. This metal is also used sometimes for the tubes of 16 feet reeds.

It is curious that if organs are sometimes played by electricity or pneumatics, they are often blown by hydraulic power, steam, or even gas engines. Of hydraulic blowers Duncan's engine is one of the very best. As gas engines seem to be coming into favour, they are probably found cheap and satisfactory.† But whatever kind of engine may be

* If the authorities had not much money to spend on their organ, they should nevertheless try to have 'spotted metal' for at least the Great Organ Open Diapason, the Choir Dulciana and Gamba, and all the reed stops in the organ.

† Gas engines are used to blow the organs at St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. The great organ recently erected at Sydney is blown by one of ten horse-power.

adopted, levers should be provided, so that, if the motive-power were suddenly cut off, the bellows might be blown by manual power.

Some other particulars may be noted. To bring the manuals closer together and render the playing easier, the keys should overhang and be cut away underneath. If the pedal keys are of good medium size, it matters little what may be the pattern of the pedal-board.* As that to which he is most accustomed is to every player the best, it is hard to say which is *the* best kind of pedal-board. It is to be regretted that one scale and pattern are not universally adopted. If the pedal-board recommended by the College of Organists were introduced everywhere, organists would not find themselves somewhat at a loss when they have to perform upon strange instruments.

Sometimes the stop-handles are arranged in such a manner as to confuse the player, or they are not labelled legibly enough. A black lettering in plain capitals is the best for the names of the stops. The number of feet tone should be put below the names, and mutation stops should be correctly labelled. A Twelfth should be labelled '$2\frac{2}{3}$ feet' (not 3 feet), and a pedal Quint '$10\frac{2}{3}$ feet' (not 12 feet). The stop-handles might be of rosewood polished, and the labels ivory-turned. The use of different colours for the labels does not help distinctness. If the manual stops, pedal stops, and couplers were kept together in groups, and a clear space left between each group, and in the spaces plates were fastened with the names of the departments the stops belong to, all would be perfectly clear. In each group the stops should be arranged according to their pitch—the 16 feet stops at the bottom, and the Mixtures at the top; but the reeds should be placed above the Mixtures. The Great Organ stops should be on the right hand of the player, and the Swell stops on the left. The stops of the Pedal Organ should be below the Swell stops, and the couplers should be at the bottom of all on the left hand. The Choir Organ stops should be on the right hand, and below the Great

* There is certainly no reason for preferring radiating pedals to the old-fashioned kind.

Organ stops, if the Choir Organ be (as it usually is) the lowest manual. The Great to Pedal should be placed so near the 'Swell to Great' that the two knobs may be drawn together. With the same object, the stop-handle of the Pedal Open Diapason should be placed near these stop-handles. The three knobs might be placed so as to form a triangle. This arrangement, always convenient, is especially useful in two-manual organs. There might be *two* knobs for the Great to Pedal, one at the right and the other at the left hand of the performer, both being so marked, or placed, as to be very distinguishable. It would be an advantage if the stops drew obliquely, that is, towards the player.

The composition pedals might be arranged as follows: The Choir Organ on the extreme right, the Swell on the extreme left, the Pedal and Great in the middle (the Pedal being to the left of the Great).* In each group the pedal on the right might draw the softest combination, and that on the left the loudest. The words 'Choir,' 'Great,' 'Pedal,' 'Swell,' might be painted very legibly in black letters on a white ground, or (which is better) in white letters on a black ground, on the wood-work above each set of composition pedals. If above each pedal numbers, or some abbreviation indicating the combination effected by the pedal, were painted, it would be helpful to the player. The Swell pedal and the pedal for bringing the Great to Pedal coupler on and taking it in, should be parallel with the pedal keys, and not in the way of the player when he uses the composition pedals. These two pedals should be so placed, shaped, or coloured, that they may be immediately distinguished from the composition pedals. All the composition pedals should be so placed that when fixed down they will not be in the organist's way when he plays on the pedal keys. Instead of composition pedals, or when it is sought to have more combinations than can be controlled by pedals, pistons or studs controlling the stops by

* The stops of the Pedal Organ are sometimes controlled by the pedals operating on the Great Organ stops: one pedal drawing at once all the Great and all the Pedal stops; another a soft Great and Pedal organ, and so on.

pneumatics are sometimes used. When the ventil system is applied, the ventils (which cut off the wind from, or admit it to, certain stops) are often managed by pedals. The system of interchangeable combinational pistons has already been mentioned.

The writer cannot quit this subject without expressing his wonder that good, nay, even fine instruments, should so often be in the hands of incompetent players. Not only are good two-manual organs frequently operated on by people (male or female) who, while they may perhaps be able to play the piano, or even to manage a harmonium, have had little practice in organ-playing, and perhaps less instruction; but fine three-manual organs are sometimes placed in the hands of ignorant and unskilful people, who are quite unequal to managing them. To those who know that the difficulties of organ-playing are great, and mastered only after years of practice, and that the beauty, variety, and grandeur of a fine organ can be exhibited only by a well-instructed player who possesses taste and experience, it is plain that ignorant and inexperienced organists cannot do justice to an organ, and that a fine instrument, if placed in their hands, must be 'completely thrown away.' It is surely absurd for a congregation to go to the expense of erecting a fine organ and then appoint a person who knows little or nothing of organs and organ-playing to play it. A fine organ, in the hands of a master, can not only perform beautiful and devotional voluntaries, but its different qualities of tone, when artistically varied and combined, give to the instrument the power to enhance the beauty of the music it accompanies. But to purchase a fine organ, with its various contrasts of power and tone-colour, and then appoint a self-taught experimenter, whose ideas are of the crudest, and who has not even mastered the first principles of organ-playing (which is an art to be learned only with good instruction and after years of study and practice) is like buying an expensive box of paints for a child to colour with, or spending a thousand pounds on a telescope for a beginner in astronomy to discover new worlds with. Novices can neither manage organs nor mix the stops, and money

spent in providing fine instruments for them to play upon (or rather it should be said, to *practise* on) is so much money wasted. It passes the comprehension that clergymen and congregations should know the importance of having fine organs in their churches, and yet desire no better playing than female music-teachers, shopmen, clerks, and the like can supply.* An organ of small size and poor quality, one thinks, might satisfy the musical requirements of people who are satisfied with the feeble, experimental performance of ignorant and incompetent organists.

The following are specifications of organs suitable for churches of different sizes. The cost of building them would depend upon the workmanship and the quality of the material used in their construction, the quality of the metal used for the pipes, and (to some extent) the reputation of the builder. The organs are supposed to be erected, *not* in organ-chambers, but in favourable situations, and to be blown at a suitable and not over-great pressure. Fancy stops (Vox Angelicas, Voix Celestes, Vox Humanas, and the like) and Tremulants are not included in the specifications. They might be added, if desired, to the Swell or Choir of any of the organs. They would not be acted upon by any of the composition pedals. In every case the compass of the manuals is supposed to be from CC to g in alt. (56 notes), and that of the Pedal Organ CCC to f (30 notes).

I.—A Two-manual Organ for a Church of the very smallest size.

Choir Organ.

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Rohrflöte (wood bass), wood and metal, CC to G	8	56
2. Dulciana, metal, CC to G . . .	8	56
3. Viol da Gamba (grooved into No. 2), metal, tenor C to G	8	44
4. Suabe Flute, wood, CC to G . . .	4	56
		212

* And such 'organists' are appointed when (may we not fear ?) competent men are unemployed, and almost starving.

Swell Organ.

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Open Diapason (five lowest notes closed wood), wood and metal, CC to G. . .	8	56
2. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G . .	8	56
3. Gemshorn, metal, CC to G . . .	4	56
4. Oboe, metal, CC to G	8	56
		224

Pedal Organ.

1. Bourdon, wood, CCC to F . . .	16	30

Couplers.

1. Swell to Choir. 2. Choir to Pedal. 3. Swell to Pedal.

Number of stops in Choir Organ . .	4
,, ,, ,, Swell ,, . .	4
,, ,, ,, Pedal ,, . .	1
Number of sounding stops . .	9
,, couplers . . .	3
Total number of stops . .	12
Number of pipes in Choir Organ . .	212
,, ,, ,, Swell ,, . .	224
,, ,, ,, Pedal ,, . .	30
Total number of pipes . .	466

If height were wanting, all the bottom octave of the Open Diapason might be of wood stopped.

II.—A Two-manual Organ for a small Church.

Great Organ.

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Bourdon, wood, CC to G . . .	16	56
2. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G . .	8	56
3. Stopped Diapason (metal treble), wood and metal, CC to G	8	56
4. Viola (wood bass), wood and metal, CC to G .	8	56

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
5. Principal, metal, CC to G . . .	4	56
6. Suabe Flute, wood, CC to G . . .	4	56
7. Mixture (II. Ranks—12, 15), metal, CC to G .	$2\frac{2}{3}$	112
8. Clarionet, metal, tenor C to G . . .	8	44
		492

Swell Organ.

1. Spitzflöte, metal, CC to G . . .	8	56
2. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G . .	8	56
3. Gemshorn, metal, CC to G . . .	4	56
4. Piccolo, wood, CC to G	2	56
5. Oboe, metal, CC to G	8	56
		280

Pedal Organ.

1. Open Diapason, wood, CCC to F . .	16	30
2. Bourdon, wood, CCC to F . . .	16	30
3. Bass Flute, wood, CCC to F . . .	8	30
		90

Couplers.

1. Swell to Great. 2. Great to Pedal. 3. Swell to Pedal.

Number of stops in Great Organ . .	8
,, ,, Swell ,, . .	5
,, ,, Pedal ,, . .	3
Number of sounding-stops . .	16
,, couplers . . .	3
Total number of stops . .	19
Number of pipes in Great Organ . .	492
,, ,, Swell ,, . .	280
,, ,, Pedal ,, . .	90
Total number of pipes . .	862

One of the Great Organ composition pedals might draw and reduce to Nos. 3 and 8. 'Clar.' might be painted over it.

Another, with 'Choir' painted over it, might draw and reduce to Nos. 3, 4, and 6, which combination would form a substitute for a Choir Organ.

One of the composition pedals to the Swell might draw and reduce to Nos. 2 and 5, and be labelled 'Oboe.'

III.—A Two-manual Organ for a Church of medium size.

Great Organ.

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Bourdon, wood, CC to G	16	56
2. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G	8	56
3. Stopped Diapason (metal treble), wood and metal, CC to G	8	56
4. Dulciana (grooved into No. 3), metal, tenor C to G	8	44
5. Principal, metal, CC to G	4	56
6. Wald Flute, wood, CC to G	4	56
7. Twelfth, metal, CC to G	$2\frac{2}{3}$	56
8. Fifteenth, metal, CC to G	2	56
9. Full Mixture (III. Ranks), metal, CC to G	various	168
10. Trumpet, metal, CC to G	8	56
11. Clarionet, metal, tenor C to G	8	44
		704

Swell Organ.

1. Lieblich Bourdon, wood, CC to G	16	56
2. Spitzflöte, metal, CC to G	8	56
3. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G	8	56
4. Keraulophon (grooved into No. 3), metal, tenor C to G	8	44
5. Gemshorn, metal, CC to G	4	56
6. Piccolo, wood, CC to G	2	56
7. Oboe, metal, CC to G	8	56
8. Cornopean, metal, CC to G	8	56
9. Clarion, metal, CC to G	4	56
		492

Pedal Organ.

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Open Diapason, wood, CCC to F . .	16	30
2. Bourdon, wood, CCC to F . . .	16	30
3. Bass Flute, wood, CCC to F . . .	8	30
4. Trombone, wood, CCC to F . . .	16	30
		120

Couplers.

1. Swell to Great. 2. Great to Pedal. 3. Swell to Pedal. 4. Swell Octave.

A composition pedal (marked 'Clar.') should draw and reduce to the Great Stopped Diapason and Clarionet. Another (marked 'Choir'), Nos. 3, 4, 6. The pedal that draws the Full Great should also draw the Full Pedal.

One of the Swell composition pedals (marked 'Oboe') should draw and reduce to Nos. 3 and 7.

Number of pipes in Great Organ . .	704
,, ,, Swell ,, . .	492
,, ,, Pedal ,, . .	120
Total number of pipes . .	1,316
Number of stops in Great Organ . .	11
,, ,, Swell ,, . .	9
,, ,, Pedal ,, . .	4
Number of sounding-stops . .	24
,, couplers . . .	4
Total number of stops . .	28

For the above a three-manual organ with 29 sounding-stops and 6 couplers (in all 35 stops) might be substituted. In this case the Great, Swell, and Pedal Organs might have the same stops as the above (with the exception of the Clarionet in the Great Organ, which would not be needed). Two additional couplers would be required, viz., Swell to Choir

and Choir to Pedal. The third manual (the Choir Organ) might contain the following stops:

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Salicional, metal, CC to G	8	56
2. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G	8	56
3. Flauto Traverso, metal, tenor C to G	8	44
4. Rohrflöte, metal, CC to G	4	56
5. Salicet, metal, CC to G	4	56
6. Clarionet (in a separate swell-box), metal, tenor C to G	8	44
		312

IV.—A Three-manual Organ for a large Church.

Great Organ.

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Double Open Diapason, metal, CC to G	16	56
2. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G	8	56
3. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G	8	56
4. Stopped Diapason (metal treble), wood and metal, CC to G	8	56
5. Viola (wood bass), wood and metal, CC to G	8	56
6. Principal, metal, CC to G	4	56
7. Harmonic Flute (wood bass), wood and metal, CC to G	4	56
8. Twelfth, metal, CC to G	$2\frac{2}{3}$	56
9. Fifteenth, metal, CC to G	2	56
10. Mixture (III. Ranks), metal, CC to G	various	168
11. Posaune, metal, CC to G	8	56
		728

Swell Organ.

1. Lieblich Bourdon, wood, CC to G	16	56
2. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G	8	56
3. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G	8	56
4. Salicional, metal, CC to G	8	56
5. Principal, metal, CC to G	4	56
6. Wald Flute, wood, CC to G	4	56

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
7. Flautina, metal, CC to G . . .	2	56
8. Mixture* (III. Ranks), metal, CC to G	various	168
9. Oboe, metal, CC to G	8	56
10. Horn, metal, CC to G	8	56
11. Clarion, metal, CC to G . . .	4	56
		728

Choir Organ.

1. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G . .	8	56
2. Spitzflöte, metal, CC to G . . .	8	56
3. Dulciana, metal, CC to G . . .	8	56
4. Viol da Gamba (grooved into No. 3), metal, tenor C to G	8	44
5. Gemshorn, metal, CC to G . . .	4	56
6. Rohrflöte, metal, CC to G . . .	4	56
7. Piccolo, metal, CC to G . . .	2	56
8. Corno di bassetto (in a swell-box), metal, CC to G	8	56
		436

Pedal Organ.

1. Open Diapason, wood, CCC to F . .	16	30
2. Bourdon, wood, CCC to F . . .	16	30
3. Violone, metal, CCC to F . . .	16	30
4. Principal, wood, CCC to F . . .	8	30
5. Bass Flute, wood, CCC to F . . .	8	30
6. Trombone, metal, CCC to F . . .	16	30
		180

Couplers.

1. Swell to Great.
2. Swell to Choir.
3. Swell Octave.
4. Great to Pedal.
5. Swell to Pedal.
6. Choir to Pedal.

* A Mixture in the Swell now appears for the first time in these specifications. It is often placed too early on this manual—sometimes in very small swells where there is not a 2 feet stop—and is then destructive of all balance.

One of the Great Organ composition pedals (marked 'Full') might draw all the Great and Pedal stops. There might be a pedal (marked 'Ob.') to draw the Swell Oboe and Stop Diapason, and reduce to them; and one (marked 'Reed') to draw and reduce to Nos. 1 and 8 of the Choir Organ; also two pedals to the Pedal Organ—one, to draw and reduce to Nos. 2 and 3 (marked 'P'); the other, to draw Nos. 1 to 5 (marked '16 and 8 feet').

Number of stops in Great Organ . .	11
„ „ Swell „ . .	11
„ „ Choir „ . .	8
„ „ Pedal „ . .	6
Number of sounding-stops . .	36
„ couplers . . .	6
	42
Number of pipes in Great Organ . .	728
„ „ Swell „ . .	728
„ „ Choir „ . .	436
„ „ Pedal „ . .	180
	2,072

In the above scheme a 32 feet stop (either an Open Diapason or a Sub-bass) might be added to the Pedal Organ.

V.—A Three-manual Organ for a Church of the largest size (or a Cathedral).

Great Organ.

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
1. Double Open Diapason, metal, CC to G. .	16	56
2. Bourdon, wood, CC to G . . .	16	56
3. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G . .	8	56
4. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G . .	8	56
5. Stopped Diapason, wood, CC to G. . .	8	56
6. Gamba, metal, CC to G . . .	8	56
7. Claribel Flute, wood, CC to G . .	8	56
8. Principal, metal, CC to G . . .	4	56

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
9. Harmonic Flute, metal, CC to G	4	56
10. Gemshorn, metal, CC to G	4	56
11. Twelfth, metal, CC to G	2⅔	56
12. Fifteenth, metal, CC to G	2	56
13. Full Mixture (III. Ranks), metal, CC to G	various	168
14. Sharp Mixture (IV. Ranks), metal, CC to G	various	224
15. Posaune (on a heavy wind), metal, CC to G	8	56
16. Clarion (on a heavy wind), metal, CC to G	4	56
		1,176

Swell Organ.

1. Bourdon (metal treble), wood and metal, CC to G	16	56
2. Open Diapason, metal, CC to G	8	56
3. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G	8	56
4. Keraulophon, metal, CC to G	8	56
5. Principal, metal, CC to G	4	56
6. Wald Flute, wood, CC to G	4	56
7. Twelfth, metal, CC to G	2⅔	56
8. Fifteenth, metal, CC to G	2	56
9. Mixture (III. Ranks), metal, CC to G	various	168
10. Contrafagotto, metal, CC to G	16	56
11. Oboe, metal, CC to G	8	56
12. Horn, metal, CC to G	8	56
13. Clarion, metal, CC to G	4	56
		840

Choir Organ.

1. Lieblich Bourdon, wood, CC to G	16	56
2. Spitzflöte, metal, CC to G	8	56
3. Lieblich Gedackt, wood, CC to G	8	56
4. Dulciana, metal, CC to G	8	56
5. Viol da Gamba (grooved into No. 4), metal, tenor C to G	8	44
6. Clarabella, wood, tenor C to G	8	44
7. Gemshorn, metal, CC to G	4	56
8. Flauto Traverso (wood bass), wood and metal, CC to G	4	56
9. Flautina, metal, CC to G	2	56

	Ft. tone.	Pipes.
10. Corno di bassetto, metal, CC to G . .	8	56
11. Orchestral Oboe, metal, fiddle G to G .	8	37
(Nos. 10 and 11 in a separate swell-box.)		573

Pedal Organ.

1. Open Diapason,* metal, CCC to F . .	32	30
2. Open Diapason, wood, CCC to F . .	16	30
3. Open Diapason, metal, CCC to F . .	16	30
4. Bourdon, wood, CCC to F . . .	16	30
5. Violone, wood, CCC to F . . .	16	30
6. Principal, metal, CCC to F . . .	8	30
7. Bass Flute, wood, CCC to F . . .	8	30
8. Fifteenth, metal, CCC to F . . .	4	30
9. Ophicleide (on a heavy wind), metal, CCC to F	16	30
10. Trumpet (on a heavy wind), metal, CCC to F	8	30
		300

Couplers, etc.

1. Swell to Great.
2. Swell to Choir.
3. Swell Octave.
4. Great to Pedal.
5. Swell to Pedal.
6. Choir to Pedal.

7, 8, 9, three ventils controlling the Pedal Organ, and worked by stop-handles, as follows:

No. 1 (labelled 'Wind to M. P. Ped.'), to admit wind to the wood Open and the Bass Flute.

No. 2 (labelled 'Wind to F. Ped.'), to admit wind to the Open Diapason (32 feet), the metal Open (16 feet), the Principal, and the Fifteenth, and draw No. 1 Ventil, but not take it in when it is itself pushed in.

No. 3 (labelled 'Wind to Full Pedal'), to admit wind to the reeds, and draw No. 2 Ventil, but not take it in when it is itself pushed in.

No. 1 Ventil, when pushed in, to take in No. 2, and No. 2, when pushed in, to take in No. 3 with it.

When No. 1 Ventil is pushed in, the wind is cut off from all the pedal stops except the Bourdon and Violone, which are

* If there were not room for this stop, a Sub-bass of 32 feet tone might be substituted for it.

on a sound-board without a ventil; and when No. 3 is drawn, the wind is admitted to all the pedal stops.

Or, instead of ventils, the Interchangeable Piston system mentioned on p. 88 might be applied. It is applicable to tubular pneumatics, on which system pedal organs are usually constructed.

The composition pedal which draws the full Great Organ should draw the 'Wind to Full Pedal.'

Number of stops in Great Organ . .	16
„ „ Swell „ . .	13
„ „ Choir „ . .	11
„ „ Pedal „ . .	10
Number of sounding-stops . .	50
„ couplers, etc. . .	9
Total number of stops . . .	59
Pipes in Great Organ . . .	1,176
„ „ Swell „ . . .	840
„ „ Choir „ . . .	573
„ „ Pedal „ . . .	300
Total number of pipes . .	2,889

If a Double Trumpet of 16 feet, another Open Diapason (8 feet), a Quint of $5\frac{1}{3}$ feet, an 'Octave' of 4 feet, a Harmonic Piccolo of 2 feet, another rank of Mixture, and a Tromba on a high pressure were added to the Great Organ, and a Sub-bass of 32 feet to the Pedal, and the scaling and voicing of the pipes, and the different pressures throughout the organ were proportioned to the size of the room or edifice, the above instrument would be powerful and varied enough for use in a building of the very largest size. Or, instead of the Tromba in the Great Organ, a Tuba might be placed in a Solo Organ, which might also contain the Corno di Bassetto (from the Choir Organ, to be replaced there by a Clarionet), two Flutes (of 8 and 4 feet), a stop of string tone, and an Open Diapason. Two new couplers would be required: Solo to Great, and Solo to Pedal.

CHAPTER III.

THE ORGANIST.

THE writer having frequently had occasion to speak of the importance of securing the services of a good organist for a church, and to remark on the foolishness of appointing ill-qualified musicians, when better might be had, now ventures to suggest what qualifications an organist should possess. For obvious reasons he would have preferred not to write on the subject, but it did not seem possible, in a book treating of Church music, to omit a chapter on the Organist.

It goes without saying, that the organist of a parish church whose duty it is to perform upon a fine organ and lead the praises of the sanctuary, ought to be a good player and sound Church musician. But it may, perhaps, not be out of place to consider what such a person should know, and in what he should be efficient, in order to perform his duties effectively.

An organist should be a good player, and in order to be this, he must (1) have a good *technique*. He must be a skilful manipulator and *pedipulator*, and have a good grasp and command of the instrument. But good playing does not consist (as many seem to think) in the power, acquired by long practice, to play difficult music at a great speed. Merely mechanical dexterity in organ playing, though very useful to its possessor, is scarcely more worthy of admiration than are the extremely clever manipulative and pedipulative feats of those performers who throw knives and dance among eggs at a fair. It may seem a clever thing for a man who has fifty-six pieces of ivory and thirty pieces of wood before him, to nimbly travel over them at a great speed with hands and feet, and never touch a wrong one. And players who can do this, and

nothing more, have often been applauded. But the test of musicianship is not the faultless mechanical rendering of a fast piece of music, but rather the tasteful and expressive performance of a *slow* movement. There are organists who can play Bach's G minor fugue mechanically at the proper pace, but would fail (because they want musical feeling) if they were asked to render an expressive *andante*, *larghetto*, or *adagio*. A man may be a 'brilliant' player, and yet have 'no music in his soul.' Such an organist astonishes the vulgar by the rapidity of his execution, but there his power ceases. He cannot afford genuine delight to people of culture, for he neither comprehends the meaning of any good music he may attempt, nor possesses 'soul' enough to render it with expression. He is not in sympathy with the music, and his rendering is either tame and unmeaning, or distorted and egregiously incorrect. A true organist, on the other hand, not only plays a slow movement with correct taste and deep feeling, but his rendering of a rapid fugue is very different from that of the mere manipulator. The playing of both the manuals and the pedals is phrased, and the fugue is treated logically (so to speak) by an artistic use of the different manuals and stops. The player, understanding the general character, the composition, and the development of the fugue, introduces meaning and expression into even so unpoetical a composition as a fugue, which in his hands is not so many pages of entangled harmonies and unintelligible notes running like 'confusion worse confounded,' but, to the connoisseur, an intellectual treat of the highest order. As a painter must know how to mix his colours, so an organist must (2) know how to mix his stops, to do which he requires a cultivated taste and a fine ear. An organist, to deserve the name of a good player, must (3) understand something of harmony, counterpoint, and composition; and (4) must render his voluntaries, not as a machine would, but with perception and taste—not straining after 'effect,' but seeking to express the thought of the composer and the inner meaning of the music.* It is most

* The individuality of the player will show itself. Two excellent recitalists would not give precisely the same rendering of a piece.

desirable (5) that he be possessed not only of musical soul and cultivated taste, but also of intelligence and devotional feeling, in order that his accompaniments may beautify, and not spoil, the psalmody. To accompany sacred music, the player must understand with the head the sense of the words, and feel with the heart the beauty and sublimity of the canticles, psalms, hymns, and anthems he accompanies. It is a pity that even good musicians sometimes show by their playing that they either do not grasp the sense of the words, or are incapable of feeling the beauty of the thought they express. They handle the organ well, and play with much artistic taste; but wanting intelligence or devotional feeling, they either fail to throw their lights and shadows where the sense of the words requires them, or else throw them where they ought not to be, and so stultify the sense. In the verse, 'Ye who have sold for nought,' of the hymn 'Blow ye the trumpet, blow,' the sense is perfectly clear. It might be thought that every organist would see that while the first two lines should be played softly, there should be an increase of organ power in the third and fourth. But the writer has heard this verse played softly throughout, whereby the point was quite lost. Perhaps the organist was one of that school who hold that such words as 'holy,' 'love,' 'peace,' should always be played softly, regardless of the connection in which they occur; or perhaps he was unable to grasp the sense; or perhaps he had regard only for the music and thought the expression of the words a matter of no moment; or perhaps he did not think at all.* An organist to properly perform his duties as an

* It is in their accompaniments that organists are generally weakest. Some, feeble players and possessing neither musical taste nor devotional feeling, are contented to play the notes as written, as well as they can. They always play the first and last verses loudly, and their registering is altogether unmeaning. Others have a good grasp of the organ, but, for want of taste and judgment, they merely display themselves and their organs. Others are good organ-players, and vary the stops artistically, and play with musical expression. Yet, from a devotional point of view, their performance is unsatisfactory; for they miss the point in some places, and destroy the sense in others. Some play correctly, and use the organ artistically, and observe the marks of expression their hymn-

executant, should be able (6) to extemporize a soft opening voluntary, and (7) to transpose at least a chant or a psalm-tune at sight. To be able to handle the organ well, to know how to mix the stops, to possess sufficient musical knowledge and perception to comprehend the music of the great masters, and taste to interpret it worthily, to accompany with intelligence and devotional feeling, to be able to extemporize a slow movement, to have facility in transposing,—these qualities should be absolutely required of every parish church organist, *considered only as a player.*

But as most organists have other duties to perform besides playing the organ, yet more qualifications are required of them. To be properly equipped, organists must possess taste and judgment that they may choose tunes to suit the words;* must know their work as choir-masters, teachers, trainers, and conductors; should be able to tune the reed-stops, and know enough of the construction of organs to be able to put right any slight disarrangements; must be acquainted with at least two of the C cleffs (the alto and tenor); must know the elements of harmony, counterpoint, and form (in sacred music);† and must be acquainted with the proper method (so far as it is known to us) of rendering anthems of the old school.

In the above the writer has briefly stated what qualifications as to executive power and Church musicianship should be demanded of organists. But a Church organist may be duly qualified musically, and yet not be perfectly fit for his

books contain; and yet even their performance is greatly inferior to that of some organists one has heard, who seem to pour their whole soul into the organ, and make the instrument not merely beautify the music, but chant and sing in a truly devotional manner. It seems that an organist, however skilful and careful a player he may be, cannot do full justice to the psalmody, if he wants genius (that Promethean fire) and the fervour of a religious soul.

* There are organists to whom clergymen dare not entrust the choosing of the tunes.

† They need not, however, be 'composers.' A great musician, speaking of the vanity and ambition of our numerous would-be composers, said: 'To judge from the tons of mere exercise work published annually, every church and chapel organist must be a born "composer"!'

post. An organist who holds a church appointment should take a proper view of the dignity of his office, and this without over-rating his own importance. (While the office is a high, even a sacred one, the man, in his own estimation, should count as nothing.) He should be punctual in his attendance, and reverent in his behaviour in church; and he should not be vain, or frivolous, or too self-willed. His conduct will influence that of the choir, who will copy him if he be punctual and reverent, but will find a ready excuse for any departures they may make from punctuality and reverence, if he be wanting in these qualities. Vanity and frivolity, and want of reverent feeling, will lead him to seek approbation when he should be thinking of the worship of God, and to choose a popular, but unsuitable, style of music for his voluntaries.* If he be too self-willed, he will not long work in harmony with the incumbent. It is also desirable that he be a patient man, for his temper will often be tried; and he should possess tact, for he will probably have to deal with some very 'touchy' people, who are more ready to take offence than to bear correction, and he must know how to administer praise without ministering to vanity and creating envy.†

Most people who read this (probably very imperfect) enumeration of the musical and other qualifications that are required of Church organists, will think that enough is asked of the members of a poorly paid profession. But there are some who require that organists shall be men of first-rate education.‡ As it is attempted to treat the question of educa-

* An earnest clergyman, and one whose powers as a preacher are very great, told the writer that he was greatly troubled by the want of reverence shown by his organist, who could not (or would not) see the impropriety of concluding Divine service with a frivolous tune on the organ.

† It may be worth saying, that to be quite fit for his post and happy in it, an organist should hold the same views as the clergyman and congregation of the church to which he is appointed. A Dissenter would not be quite in his right place if he were engaged to play the Church services. And there could be little sympathy between an old-fashioned Churchman and a young organist of the new school who liked Gregorians and choral celebrations.

‡ The writer is informed that clergymen are beginning to prefer organists who have taken a B.A. degree.

tion in the Appendix, it may be sufficient here to notice the absurdity of appointing to vacant organistships well-educated men, who, however, are perhaps only very inferior musicians, in preference to men who have not had 'a good education,' but are able and experienced organists. Music being a language with a grammar of its own, and an art governed by its own laws, seems to have little in common with the subjects read during an University course. To perform effectively upon an organ, understand and interpret musical compositions, choose music for the Church service, and train a choir, a man certainly does not need a knowledge of Classics and Mathematics.

Hoping thereby to secure the services of men of pious conversation, clergymen sometimes impose one or both of two tests on candidates for vacant organistships. It is not uncommon to see in a newspaper an advertisement for an organist who must be a communicant; and sometimes it is stated that candidates should be 'total abstainers.' The writer was staying at the house of a clergyman who had advertised for an organist, but had *not* imposed these tests on candidates. Every post brought letters from applicants, of whom some stated that they were communicants, and others that they were 'total abstainers,' while others said they were both. The excellent Mr. T—— thought no better of the applicants for giving this gratuitous information. He could not understand how total abstinence could be a recommendation in an organist, and he did not like candidates who were so ready to proclaim that they were communicants.* He required, indeed, of his organists that they should be *sober* men; and, while he would not in the smallest degree force them, *hoped* that they were, or would become, communicants.

* The use that advertisers for organistships and places as domestic servants make of the fact of their being communicants often seems suspicious, and sometimes truly impious. It apparently does not occur to unsuspecting clergymen, that by imposing the communicant test they may sometimes tempt people, who are very anxious to obtain a situation, to commit an act of impiety of a horrible and peculiarly dangerous kind. But the subject is a painful one.

Years ago it was the delight of the writer, as often as he could, to attend the service at St. Sepulchre's Church, where the late George Cooper was organist. (This was before the rage for choral services, surpliced choirs, and pulling down west galleries had seized on us.) All who have heard that great organist will remember that he handled the organ in an artistic and truly devotional style in his voluntaries and accompaniments. We have in the following remarks of the late Sir John Goss* an insight into George Cooper's mind, and the principles that guided him: 'He always places the worship of God first, then the composer's views or intentions, his choir next, then his organ, and himself last.'† This admirable musician not only had complete mastery over his organ, and played it with taste; but he rendered the music with expression, and his intelligence and devotional feeling enabled him to accompany the psalmody in a truly delightful and elevating manner. While few organists could attain to such perfection as musicians, all might, with benefit to the Church service, try to cultivate the same spirit of piety which led this excellent organist to 'place himself last.'

* Reproduced by a writer who knew Goss and Cooper, in a letter to the *Musical Standard* of June 14, 1890.

† Many of our modern organists exactly reverse this order, and place *themselves* first, and the *worship* last.

CHAPTER IV.

VOLUNTARIES.

LOVERS of the organ cannot have failed to notice with concern the remarkable falling-off in voluntaries. The object of this paper is to hold up the mirror, and call the attention of our younger organists to the irreverent style of voluntary-playing adopted by some of them, and the unsuitableness of such music in the services of the Sanctuary.

It seems to the writer that a want of artistic and devotional feeling, combined, in some instances, with vanity (which prompts the desire to show off a skilful manipulation to an admiring congregation and gain public applause), must be at the root of this change. This much, at least, is certain, that a person wanting in devotional feeling is as much unfitted to officiate at a church organ as a dull, heavy person, devoid of rhythmical feeling, and having no appreciation for the light and pretty in music, would be out of place if he figured as pianist at a dancing-party. And, as to the silly promptings of vanity, these, if yielded to, will destroy the usefulness of the church organist, who, as a servant of the Church, appointed to lead the praises of the Almighty, should be influenced by no selfish feelings, but simply by the desire to do his duty well.

The church is a 'house of prayer,' and not a field for the performances of an egotist. An Old Testament prophet says, 'The Lord is in His holy Temple'; and our Lord says, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.' Remembering these plain words of Scripture, a moment's consideration will show how irreverent and

horrible a thing it must be, for an organist of a church to turn to his own use the assembling of the people in the Lord's House, and seek, by brilliant displays of 'finger,' and adopting a light, 'popular' style of voluntary, to get public applause—in other words, to seek his own glorification rather than the glory of Him from Whom music and all other good gifts come; to lay his offering on the altar of self; and—worse than the Unprofitable Servant in the parable—to appropriate the Talent entrusted to his charge, and use it for his own purposes.

From the artist's point of view, anything like pandering to an uneducated, popular taste is to be deprecated. Forkel says of Bach: 'He never worked for the crowd, but always had in his mind an ideal perfection, without any view to approbation. He sang only for himself and the Muses.' And Dr. Crotch, in his Lectures, says: 'A lasting reputation is seldom acquired quickly. It is by a slower process—by the prevailing commendation of a few real judges—that true worth is finally discovered and rewarded.' At the same time, however, an organist, being no more than human, is, and must be, often sorely tempted to forget these canons and 'play to suit the people' and win a speedy reputation as a musician.

In speaking of the taste of the people as uneducated, the writer makes no mistake. The public like to be pleased, and care very little about Art, of the great principles of which they are profoundly ignorant. The sublime they consider a 'bore.' They find nothing admirable in a Doric column, a cartoon of Raffaele, or a majestic composition of Bach. Indeed, one may say without hesitation, that if a great master of the organ were to play the most sublime composition of Bach, and the name of the player and the composition were unknown to the congregation, not half-a-dozen persons would stay to listen to him. But if next Sunday a young organist of the new school were to play a light 'showy' piece, full of 'effects'—the more exaggerated the better, to be sure!—introducing 'fancy stops' and tremendous contrasts of tone and colour, and making a great display of manipulation and pedipulation—all of which go for so much with the multitude—many would stay and

listen to the 'pretty music.' This shows not only an uncultivated taste on the part of the public, but also a profound ignorance of the real art of organ-playing and the difficulties thereof.* The connoisseur of the organ despises the weak, sentimental style and 'pretty' effects, and hates exaggeration and the never-ending use of 'fancy stops'; and, far from considering rapid mechanical playing the *Ultima Thule* of musical navigators, insists on correct phrasing, and many other good qualities. But he gives the chiefest place to a refined taste and expression. And properly so. A skilful manipulation may be got by long practice; but feeling, which makes the musician as well as the poet, when it is found at all, is inborn, and cannot be acquired. Feeling, which is the very soul of music, is as much nobler than mere mechanical skill as the human soul is more precious than the body. A barrel-organ plays with the utmost correctness; it attacks and executes the most difficult passages with absolute precision; it is truly a wonderful mechanical player; nay, it is even provided with stops: but, for all this, the connoisseur does not like it, for to him there can be no music where expression is wanting.

Of *introductory voluntaries* little need be said, except that they are intended to 'edify,' and not to amuse, and tickle the ears of the congregation, who are about to join in the most serious of all business—the Service of the Church. As people when they are in church ought to lay aside all worldly thoughts as improper for the occasion, so the organist should for the time forget all secular strains, and choose some quiet calm movement for his voluntary. A soft, slow piece for the organ, which requires no showy registering, but may be played on the Swell Diapasons and the 8 feet flue-stops of the Choir Organ, or a slow extempore movement—not unmeaning, but artistically constructed as to form, and contrapuntal in style—makes a better introductory voluntary than Rossini's 'Cujus

* Sir Joshua Reynolds says: 'It is the lowest style of art, whether of painting, poetry, or music, that may be said, in the vulgar sense, to be naturally pleasing. The higher efforts of these arts, we know by experience, do not affect minds wholly uncultivated. A refined taste is the consequence of education and habit.'

Animam' (which is not organ music at all), and does not distract the devout worshippers, who are tuning their hearts and minds 'to great Jehovah's praise.'

The use of the *concluding voluntary*, someone says, is to cover the noise and shuffling made by the people as they leave church.* But surely this is putting to an ignoble use an artist and the 'king of instruments,' whose powers are so beautifully referred to by the poet in his great Ode:

> 'But, oh! what art can teach,
> What human voice can reach
> The sacred organ's praise?
> Notes inspiring holy love,
> Notes that wing their heavenly ways
> To mend the choirs above.'

It seems to the writer that the use of the concluding voluntary is not so much to 'play the people out,' as to furnish a worthy and appropriate termination to a service in which music is often employed. Nay, an organist may use his 'divine art' to accentuate, as it were, the leading thought of the sermon by choosing a suitable voluntary. Thus, a sermon in which the Everlasting Kingdom of our Saviour is dwelt on, may most appropriately, and with excellent effect, be followed by the 'Hallelujah' chorus on the organ. Or the voluntary may be chosen to suit the Sunday, the season, the lessons, or even some striking passage in the Psalms, as some clergymen choose the texts for their sermons. For example, on Septuagesima Sunday, 'The heavens are telling,' if not sung as an anthem, would be a suitable voluntary;* 'Lift up

* The little attention paid to their concluding voluntaries has led some organists to 'play the people out,' and then perform one or two pieces for the benefit of those who love organ music. At some London churches the organists give a short recital after the evening service. Many will remember the beautiful performances of the late George Cooper at St. Sepulchre's, when the organ (then the largest in London) stood in the gallery.

† This favourite piece might be played as a concluding voluntary on a fine moonlight night. Care should be taken that the voluntary really be appropriate. It is amusingly related of an organist, that he played 'Achieved is the glorious work' at a wedding, and of a vocalist, that he sang 'Be thou faithful unto death' on a similar occasion.

your heads' would suit Ascension Day (and the morning Psalms for the fifth day of the month); and after evening service on Easter Day, 'The horse and his rider' chorus might be played, or, still better, 'Worthy is the Lamb' and the 'Amen' chorus. On the other hand, an organist may almost destroy the effect of a sermon by playing an inappropriate voluntary. What more dreadful than to hear the familiar and joyous strains:

> 'See the conquering hero comes,
> Sound the trumpets, beat the drums,'

coming from the organ, when one has just been listening to a funeral sermon on the death of some estimable person: what more excruciating, and repulsive to our best feelings, than to hear an organ strike up a dance-tune, a roaring march, or a frivolous *offertoire*, when we are moved by the eloquence of some earnest preacher! And yet even such indecencies as these are committed.

In a famous place of worship in London the writer once heard—with amazement—a noisy, popular march played as a concluding voluntary. Shortly afterwards he was at the Crystal Palace, and heard the same march on the organ there. The feeling that prompted such a display in the sacred building was detestable, as was also the effect of the music within those hallowed walls; but the Palace player showed his correct judgment by choosing a popular, secular piece with which to please *his* audience, and *there* the effect of the march was excellent, the music being suited to the building, the audience, and the occasion—a display of fireworks. The writer once spent some time at a large town, and visited some of the churches. At one church an appealing sermon was hardly ended and the benediction pronounced, when the organist commenced a gavotte, to which the congregation danced slowly out of church. At another church an earnest sermon by a venerable preacher was followed by a quick march, the martial strains jarring strangely on the ear. At other churches books full of marches, French music, and *offertoires*, lay on the organ-stools—stuff easy enough to play,

but a sad substitute for the voluntaries of Rink, Hesse, and other genuine organ music.

Having dealt with the light and popular voluntary, and said something of the peculiar unfitness of such playing in church, it will be refreshing to turn over the leaf and give one or two examples of the highest and purest style of organ-playing, which may be taken as worthy models of the grand and devotional concluding voluntary. Let our first example be an extemporaneous Prelude and Fugue by a great musician,* one of whose magnificent performances—if, indeed, that can be called a 'performance,' when the listener forgets the performer, and the delighted mind feeds on the music, as the glorious sound-waves come rolling on one after another—the writer was privileged to hear.† For our second example of grand and legitimate organ-playing we will go to Germany, where the organists of the more important churches often extemporize in a truly learned and masterly style. The writer will not soon forget the performance of one of them, who extemporized in the true organ style—the style of Bach. (The reader will find this kind of playing described in Forkel's 'Life of Bach,' chapter iv.) This was the art the venerable Reinken thought was lost, till he heard Bach play. Although few could hope even to approach these two great masters of the art, whose performances have been chosen as models of concluding voluntaries, much less to attain to such perfection, yet that is no reason why anyone should wilfully forget the true style of organ-playing, and, wandering from the road that leads to Parnassus, set out for the musical Antipodes.‡

* The late Sir Frederick Ouseley. This amiable gentleman, when the writer thanked him for his kindness in playing, said he 'could play better thirty years ago.' It cannot be out of place here to record a remark which shows the greatness of a truly estimable Church musician.

† Cecil in his 'Remains' tells us that he was overwhelmed by Handel's music, yet he never in his life heard it, but he could think of something else at the same time. 'But,' he says, 'there is a kind of music that will not allow this. Dr. Worgan has so touched the organ at St. John's that I have been turning backward and forward over the Prayer-book for the first lesson in Isaiah, and wondered that I could not find Isaiah there!'

‡ As there appears to be, in some quarters, a growing distaste for extempore voluntaries, it may be well to say that this kind of playing has

Pandering to an uneducated public taste by playing light, popular music, is the more inexcusable, as some of the great masters have left us a rich legacy of music composed expressly for the organ, and their other works furnish hundreds of pieces which, with very little 'adapting,' would make excellent voluntaries. As some of this classical music is easy, even learners may play good music for their voluntaries. (It would, indeed, be undesirable that they should force on congregations their crude rendering of Bach's music.)

If the question were put, Which would be the more appropriate conclusion to Divine service—a grand organ fugue or chorus by one of the great masters, or a trumpery dance-tune, march, or frivolous *offertoire?* everyone would say the former. And yet there are not a few young organists who in actual practice choose the latter, to the scandal of their profession, the disgust of all intelligent people, the distraction of the devout, and the grief and annoyance of their clergymen, who are naturally hurt when their evangelical efforts are capped by an unseemly display by some conceited or ambitious manipulator.

Our good ancestors, in composing and playing, carefully distinguished the different styles, and kept in view the genius of the instruments on which their thoughts were to be produced. Forkel says of Bach and his eldest son, William Friedmann: 'Both were elegant performers on the clavichord; but when they came to the organ, no trace of the harpsichord player was to be perceived. Melody, harmony, motion, etc., all was different—that is, all was adapted to the nature of the instrument and its destination. When I heard William Friedmann on the harpsichord, all was delicate, elegant, and agreeable. When I heard him on the organ, I was seized with

at least two great advantages—it may be either jubilant or plaintive (to suit the season or the sermon), or neutral in character, and it may easily be brought to an end. At churches where the in-going voluntaries are not extempore, it often happens that either the piece has to be mutilated, or spun out by a *coda* of the organist's improvising, or perhaps a portion of it repeated; or the clergyman has to remain seated till the ceasing of the organ announces to him that he may begin the service.

reverential awe. There all was pretty; here all was grand and solemn. The same was the case with John Sebastian, but both in a much higher degree of perfection. The organ compositions of this extraordinary man are full of the expression of devotion, solemnity, and dignity; but his unpremeditated voluntaries on the organ, where nothing was lost in writing down, are said to have been still more devout, solemn, dignified, and sublime.'

An irreverent voluntary is the offspring of ignorance and vanity, and perhaps, ambition, and is a certain sign of a want of true artistic and devotional feeling, which is the chiefest qualification of a Church musician. 'I foresee,' said Hannibal sadly, 'the fall of Carthage.' And when the writer considers the immense influence that Church organists have in forming the public taste, and then thinks of the frivolous strains he has so often heard in church, he is put in mind of that exclamation. Will the true art of organ-playing in the course of a few more generations become a thing of the past, only to be read of in books?

The writer's object in this paper is to call attention to a matter of great importance, whether it be regarded from an artistic or a devotional point of view. And at the risk of being thought tedious, he has endeavoured to be clear. More might have been said on our subject; but we may now conclude with the beautiful words of Hufeland—words which, though addressed to members of a very different profession, might profitably be studied by many Church organists: 'Thine is a high and holy office; see that thou exercise it purely; not for thine own advancement, not for thine own honour, but for the glory of God and the good of thy neighbour. Hereafter thou wilt have to give an account of it.'

CHAPTER V.

THE USE OF THE ORGAN IN THE CHURCH SERVICES.

UNTIL lately it would have been thought strange if anyone, writing seriously about Church music, had spoken slightingly of the church organ. But some time ago the writer of an article in a leading paper called the organ a 'necessary evil, but still an evil,' and advised every clergyman who had not already an organ in his church, to pause before he got one. This writer believes that the bad choral singing heard in so many churches, is to be attributed not only to want of proper training, but also to an undue love for, and an excessive use of, the instrument in the Church services. While he is a lover of vocal harmony and anxious for the improvement of church choir singing, he appears to have only a poor opinion of the church organ. While admitting that organs may be useful to accompany elaborate music, he believes that 'choirs which never sing anything beyond a fairly simple anthem or service would do well to sing without organ altogether; in other words, that an organ accompaniment spoils good harmonized singing.' There need be no difficulty, he says, in starting the hymns and chants 'if the organ were entirely banished,' for the matter might be arranged somehow. 'The sounding of the key-note on a pitch-pipe might seem at first strange to a congregation unused to it, but not half so strange as the noise of an organ would be to a congregation accustomed only to unaccompanied singing.' Every musician will understand this writer's love for unaccompanied choral harmony. All who have heard 'Almighty and Everlasting,' and similar anthems sung by a good cathedral

choir, will readily concede that such compositions are better without the accompaniment of an organ, especially as instruments are now tuned. In the beautiful compositions of the old contrapuntists for the Pope's chapel, the organ would be still more objectionable. But choruses *alla Palestrina* are the most difficult of all choral music, and they are not often heard in our churches. Before our choirs can sing the *coro à capella* they must attain to perfection, and judging from the present rate of progress, this may perhaps happen about the year 3000. At present they would fail in a 'fairly simple anthem or service,' if they were unsupported by the organ. Besides, in anthems and services there is often an organ part which is not a doubling of the voices, but an independent accompaniment, and to omit this would be to ruin the composition.* One of the easiest and best known anthems is Clarke's 'I will lift up mine eyes;' but if this were sung without the organ the effect of a considerable portion would be absurd. If our choirs were able to render the Church music without the help of an organ, their performance would be extremely pleasing to listen to; but people would soon become weary of unaccompanied choir-singing, and wish to hear the organ again. Besides, there could be no congregational singing, worthy of the name, without the organ. The choir alone could not lead and support the congregation, for it would not be heard sufficiently. To do this an organ is required, and the instrument does it admirably. It binds together the harmonious voices of the choir and the (often) inharmonious voices of the congregation, into one mass, and covers innumerable faults which would certainly spoil all the best efforts of a choir that sang without accompaniment. The tendency of congregations is to drag and sing flat, and the choir alone would not be able to keep them from falling and

* In some anthems the accompaniment is almost, if not quite, as important as the voice parts. In Wesley's great anthem, 'The Wilderness,' there is, in places, so much work for the instrument, that the organ part is written on three staves. True, such compositions are not 'fairly simple' music, but the number of easy anthems and services which could not be performed without an organ accompaniment is great.

dragging most lamentably, if even they were able to keep up the pace and pitch themselves. It would be necessary pretty often to have recourse to the 'pitch-pipe.' The above has been written only because the article to which reference is made appeared in a very high-class paper indeed, which is read by the clergy and other influential people.

A church organ is used to lead, support, and bind together the voices of the choir and congregation, and cover over the faults in the congregational singing, which, without the help of an instrument, either could not exist at all or would be very offensive. But the instrument is further useful. By supplying a musical colouring and light and shade varied to suit the sense of the words, it causes the Psalms and hymns and anthems to strike the heart with greater force. With its different qualities of stops, it can, in the hands of a master, produce beautiful effects; and it has the power to vary the harmonies and produce beautiful contrasts. It also announces the tunes that are about to be sung, and its persuasive tones invite the people to join in the psalmody. Formerly a short organ-piece, or middle voluntary, was played; and this practice, though perhaps it was not quite liturgical, was certainly very agreeable to musical people. In some churches a voluntary is played during the collection, or short pieces are played between the offertory sentences. Even before the service commences, the soft strains of the organ are heard as the skilful musician preludes. A grand and devotional piece of organ-music—perhaps extemporaneous, perhaps the composition of some great writer for the organ—closes the service; or a number from some oratorio, chosen because the words either suit the leading thought of the preacher, or make reference to some event in sacred history, or some great truth that has been put before the congregation in the service for the day, affords sincere, and (may it not be said?) holy pleasure to people who have just completed their religious duties. Since the organ can do, and in good hands often does, all this, it must be a great power for good in a church. If in bad hands it proves a source of mischief, this makes nothing against the usefulness of the organ itself. The gentleman who wrote to a

paper to say he 'wished half the organs in England were burnt up,' could never have heard the organ well played.

But our proper subject is 'The use of the organ in the Church services.' The organ, considered as an accompanying instrument, can produce the most marvellous effects for good or for evil. It can bring out the sense of the words, or stultify it—it can raise devotion to the highest pitch, or destroy it by causing music that should 'lift the soul to heaven' to become frivolous and unmeaning.

If a congregation take part in the singing—and unquestionably congregations ought to be encouraged to do so—the organist's chief business is to lead and support them. This being so, he cannot play with as much expression as he would if he only had to accompany a choir or chorus of trained singers. He can introduce light and shade and variety of colouring only to a limited extent. Delicate accompaniments are not heard at all. While the accompaniment must not be obtrusive, it must be loud enough to support the congregation. Sudden changes, when the sense demands them, are artistic, but not always very safe. A change from *f* to *pp* frightens the congregation, who stop at once, as if afraid to hear their own voices, and a change from *p* to *ff* is a signal for congregations (and sometimes choristers) to scream. For all this, considerable light and shade may be introduced, especially if the choir be strong. A monotonous organ accompaniment can never be required. There are contrasts and climaxes that must be powerfully marked. It can never be necessary to play with the swell reeds drawn from the beginning of the service to the end, or to accompany the hymns on the full Swell with an octave coupler drawn—though the writer has heard this done. The continual use of the reeds is pleasing only to those who prefer noise to expression, and think the 'trumpet's loud clangour' the most pleasing of all musical sounds—though these players perhaps find a precedent for their noisy registering in the compositions of some modern musicians. (The proper use of the full Swell, with the *crescendo*, especially if the Pedal Diapasons are used at the same time, produces one of the finest effects obtainable on a musical

instrument. It is therefore to be regretted that the abuse of these means by some organists—especially the swell pedal, too often used in unmeaning 'see-sawing'—should have led others somewhat to neglect the magnificent effects to be obtained by a judicious use of the full Swell.) In anthems, which are rendered by the choir only, the organ may be quite artistically varied; the organist's talents may fully display themselves, and full justice may be done to the music. The accompanying of choral music (strictly so-called) is different from, and easier than, congregational music. In accompanying congregational singing, it is always necessary to put on more organ-power than would be used in accompanying a choir only; for in a church where all sing, the choir and the organ are heard well only by those near them—and this is especially the case when the organ and choir are on the ground-floor. A feeble accompaniment deadens the spirit of the people, but a free use of organ-power makes them sing. In a fairly large church where the people take part in the singing, the amount of organ-tone should seldom, if ever, be reduced below two Diapasons and the Principal on the Great Organ (with Swell coupled), the Diapasons (with the Double), Principal, and Hautboy on the Swell. Two 8 feet flue-stops and the Principal on the Choir would be the softest combination advisable; indeed, it would generally be well to couple the Swell Diapasons and Principal to the Choir. When a louder and fuller accompaniment was needed, another 8 feet reed and a 2 feet stop might be added to the Swell, and the Double Diapason and a Flute of 4 feet to the Great Organ. (The use of the Doubles—even the Bourdon in the Swell—has sometimes been objected to by purists, as these stops double everything, and the effect, they say, is very bad, especially in polyphonic music. But the Doubles give great dignity and effect, and when combined with a good number of 8 and 4 feet stops, they are generally admissible.) In an organ with only two manuals the softest combination advisable would be the Stopped Diapason and Flute on the Great Organ with two Diapasons and Principal on the Swell coupled. The bright 4 feet metal flue-stop, called in England the 'Principal,' well deserves its honourable name, for it is

invaluable in accompanying the singing. A combination of two Diapasons and Principal is more effective than a combination of many stops of 8 feet tone would be.

But the organ does more than lead the congregational singing. By making the psalmody more soul-stirring than it would be if sung without accompaniment, it moves the congregation to join in the services, and stimulates the lukewarm to earnestness and devotion. In order that it may do this, the organist must be an earnest and devout man, for a man cannot impart to others what he does not possess himself. The organ assists in expressing the sense of the words sung, and thus the organist is in some sense an interpreter of the sacred writings. It is therefore very necessary that he understand the sense of the Psalms and hymns he has to accompany. Some hymns express so little, and express that little so poorly, that it is hard to grasp the sense of them, and difficult to treat them musically. But the Psalms are full of sublimity and beauty, and lend themselves admirably to musical treatment. The beauty and sublimity of the inspired language is apparent at a first reading, but the sense is not always immediately apparent. Often it is not to be grasped without study. It would doubtless be good for organists to procure and read some book explanatory of the Psalms. If they did so, they would know which passages to emphasize and place in high light, and the sense would not so often be stultified by improper accompaniment. An organist who does not understand with the head, and feel with the heart, the meaning of the Psalms, is no more fit to accompany them than a clergyman, ignorant of the sense, and unable to feel the beauty of the language, would be fit to read the Book of Isaiah in church. Such an organist might be a fine player, and have a good organ to perform upon, but his playing would often be painful to listen to, while a less gifted executant might touch the heart by an intelligent and devotional rendering of the inspired words. It must be confessed that the organ, though capable of so much, is often used in a feeble and inexpressive way, even when the sense is perfectly plain. The Easter anthem, 'Christ our Passover,' for example, with its antithetical clauses, admits of, and

requires, a vigorous organ accompaniment. But how often the organ fails to do as much as it might! While some organists are full of fire, others seem to be cold and dull, and nothing better than mechanical players. In the hands of some men the writer has heard, the organ gives no uncertain sound; such organists are sometimes said to make the organ 'speak.' But some organists use the organ only feebly, or their accompaniment is stereotyped. The first and last verses of the hymns are always played loudly—some words, as 'holy,' 'peace,' 'love,' are always played softly, without regard to the context—or the stops are changed and the organ-power increased or diminished unmeaningly, even in the middle of a verse where change is uncalled for. It has become the fashion to play the words 'Holy, holy, holy,' in the *Te Deum* softly—though they occur in a hymn of praise, and the rest of the verse certainly requires a loud accompaniment. In the hymn sung everywhere on Trinity Sunday, the same treatment is adopted—though surely it is wrong, except in the third verse In the other verses it seems quite a mistake to sing and play these words softly. In the last verse especially a loud accompaniment seems to be required. Artistic and devotional feeling requires the expressing of thoughts rather than single words. Playing softly, when the thought of penitence is before us, the tones of the organ increase as we hope for forgiveness; and when we sing of salvation and of Him who accomplished it for us, the great burst of praise from the congregation is accompanied by a corresponding increase of organ-power. When we contemplate the sufferings of the Redeemer we sing softly; but when we gratefully remember, and praise Him for those sufferings, we raise our voices. The true purport of the words must be grasped by the organist who would play with expression. By a proper use of the organ great (and legitimate) effects may be produced. The very silence of the instrument sometimes produces a beautiful effect—as in the verse 'Frail children of dust,' in the hymn 'O worship the King'—though it is somewhat hazardous. It must surely be an honourable calling, this of organist, to lead the psalmody and be instrumental in infusing warmth and devotional feeling into a con-

gregation of hundreds of fellow-worshippers. But an organist, to infuse the warmth, must be something more than a clever and tasteful player, he must understand the sense of the words he accompanies, and play with intelligence and feeling.

An organist, in accompanying, does not always play the notes in four-part harmony as written, and with both hands on the same manual, but sometimes treats the organ orchestrally or harmonically. In the orchestral and harmonical styles a good organist may produce beautiful effects; but a player who has not a very correct taste and great skill in managing his organ, and is not a good harmonist, had better not attempt them. Want of taste accounts for the silly 'tootling' sometimes heard. Want of decision, or slowness in changing the stops and getting from one manual to another, is indicated by a slowness on the part of the organ, and a looseness which is painful to listen to. False harmonies are distressing.

In the orchestral style stops are used as solo stops, either to play the melody of the tune, or to play little characteristic phrases and hold notes in imitation of the wood-wind in the orchestra. On even a small two-manual organ a great variety of colouring is possible—clarionet, hautboy, flute, gamba (or another string-stop), cornopean, horn, or trumpet on Swell—these singly or mixed, playing sometimes at normal pitch, sometimes an octave above or below, produce pleasing effects. But the orchestral style must not be too freely used; as, though effective when introduced occasionally, it soon palls on the ear, and even becomes annoying and distracting. The writer once heard an organist, a gentleman of considerable manipulative power, who introduced it continually, changing his colouring at almost every verse of the Psalms, regardless of the sense of the words. Sometimes he played the melody on a flute at 2 feet pitch, then on a reed at 16 feet; then he inverted an inner part and played it on a string-stop of 4 feet; then he added a few notes of his own improvising on the clarionet, and so on. The Great Organ he used only in the Glorias. This performance proved that the player had good command of his instrument. But the skill exhibited was

merely mechanical. The sound was unmeaning; the continually changing colouring was as painful to the ear, as a street in which all the houses were painted a different colour would be painful to the eye. Presumably the player introduced his elaborate accompaniments in order to 'show off' his organ.* But it is certain that organs were never put into churches to turn people's attention from the duties of prayer and praise. Thoughtful men are offended at such unnecessary display, and people are not wanting, who say of such fanciful players, that they are as anxious to exhibit their own powers as those of the organs they perform upon. When the orchestral style is employed, it should not be for less than at least one whole phrase, and patchiness should be avoided. It is not uncommon for beginners to single out two or three notes, and bring them into prominence by treating them orchestrally. The writer heard in a cathedral (where the organ was in the hands of a pupil of the organist) the *Magnificat* finished in a very singular fashion. When the authentic cadence, with which the composition ended, was reached, it occurred to the organist, who up to this time had been playing quietly, to add an embellishment of his own. Singling out the leading note, he executed a long-spun shake on it on one of the top notes of a flute stop. The effect was very striking indeed. Dr. Johnson used to say, if a man could remember any particular colour a woman was wearing when he met her, it was a proof she was not dressed with taste, the colour must have been striking, and not in harmony with the rest, or it would not have been particularly remarked. If the analogy holds good, the writer concludes that his remembering this flute performance proves it to have been in bad taste. The orchestral style is not used in accompanying the grand old tunes; it would be as improper there as the ornamental style would be out of place in a Doric column. The clarionet and flute would sound strange in the 'Old Hundredth' psalm tune. The temptation to use this style

* The writer has even heard the flute, clarionet, and cornopean stops used in accompanying the Litany. And at this church they had, as they believed, 'improved the services'!

is doubtless great, but it is a question to what extent it may be safely indulged. This much may be said: the orchestral style is not necessary to an expressive rendering of Church music, and therefore may be omitted altogether. A solid style of playing is never objectionable. If improperly or too freely used, the orchestral style is distracting and irritating, and sometimes positively a hindrance to devotion. Unmeaning tootling on flute and clarionet stops, and the intolerable squeaking of the piccolo or flageolet stop, with all uncalled-for displays of the organist's finger or fancy, are in the worst possible taste.

If pleasing and ornamental effects are got by treating the organ orchestrally, the effects obtained from the organ when treated harmonically are grand and elevating. On the organ harmony in many parts is possible. An organist does not always play in four-part harmony; he obtains an agreeable variety by sometimes adding a new part or parts, and playing in five or six parts. Sometimes he varies the bass, sometimes he plays an independent accompaniment—as there are choruses which have an independent accompaniment for a portion of the orchestra; or he requests the choir to sing a verse in unison, and plays entirely new harmonies. These last two variations should be introduced but seldom, and only when the choir is strong and the tune well known by the congregation. They should not be used for less than a whole verse. The harmonic treatment enhances the beauty and dignity of the psalmody without disturbing the congregation, and as it is more church-like than the orchestral style, it may be used more freely.

There is also an imitative use of the organ, confined chiefly to imitating instruments of music and hinting at natural phenomena. Though much light has been thrown on the subject by the researches of scholars and the discoveries of travellers, there is, and always must be, some doubt about the construction and *timbre* of the ancient instruments. They may, however, be divided into 'stringed instruments,' plucked with the finger or the *plectrum* (of which the 'harp' was the type), the wood-wind (of which the 'pipe' was the

chief), the 'horn' or 'cornet' family (corresponding to our brass instruments), and instruments of percussion. These last it is beyond our power to imitate. The 'lute and harp' may be approximately imitated by playing chords in *arpeggio* on a stopped flute, but it would hardly be possible to introduce such an imitation in accompanying the psalmody. The 'pipe' may be imitated with sufficient closeness on a flute-stop, and the 'shawm' by a characteristic passage in the middle of the key-board, on the *corno di bassetto*, clarionet, or hautboy stop. The 'sound of the trumpet' may be marked by a few trumpet-notes on the Swell reeds or the trumpet in the Great Organ. But these imitations should be rare, and managed so as to avoid vulgarity. The trumpet-call in 'Luther's Hymn' was absurd and irreverent. Attempts to depict natural phenomena too often border on the ludicrous, and consequently should be sparingly used. It is indeed possible to hint at fire and the blowing of the wind, by using the full swell, playing an octave higher, or with an octave coupler drawn; and thunder may be hinted at by holding some of the lowest notes of the pedal diapasons for a moment. Such an imitation might be introduced at the words, 'The earth was moved and shook withal,' in the 77th Psalm.

In playing over the tunes before the congregation commence to sing them, there is scope for artistic treatment. A tune needs not always to be played through with both hands on the same manual. The treble may be played on a solo stop, the inner parts with the left hand on some soft 8 feet stop, and the bass on soft 16 and 8 feet stops. When the four parts are played very smoothly—which is not always the case—the effect is very agreeable. The grand old tunes of four lines are best 'given out' by playing with both hands on the diapasons of the Great Organ. When these old tunes have more than four lines a pleasing variety may be admitted, without taking from the dignity of the music. In many German *chorăle* the first two lines are repeated. In giving out such tunes, if these lines are played on the diapasons of the Great Organ and repeated on the diapasons of another manual, the effect is very beautiful. In the well-known tune,

'Nun danket alle Gott,' the third, fourth, and seventh lines might be played on the Swell or Choir diapasons, and the rest of the tune on the diapasons of the Great Organ. The objectionable practice obtains in some places, of playing over only a line or two of the hymn tunes, as if the organists did not think the tunes worth finishing, or did not wish to detain the congregation longer than they could help.

These remarks do not exhaust the subject, but probably enough has been said to show that an organ, in proper hands, is of great value in the Church services. If improperly managed, the organ is no help to devotion; indeed, in bad hands it is often a hindrance, if not positively a nuisance. But when it beautifies the music without asserting itself too much, and draws the people to join in an expressive and devotional rendering of the psalmody, this noble instrument can hardly be esteemed too highly.

The above, it is scarcely needful to say, has been written for the consideration of inexperienced organists only. But hearing good organists play is better than reading anything that could be written on the subject of organ-playing. The art of accompanying the services is best learned by hearing the best organists and comparing their styles.

PART III.

THE CHOIR.

'As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there.'—Psalm lxxxvii. 7.

CHAPTER I.

WOMEN AND BOYS IN CHURCH CHOIRS.

AMONG the many and various changes affecting Church music that have been made during the last quarter of a century, the substitution of boys' voices in choirs for those of women is not one of the least important. Once hardly to be seen anywhere in church choirs, boys now are found in very many places; not only in large towns, but also in small towns and villages, they are often to be seen occupying the choir-seats formerly occupied by women. The fancy that the *soprano* parts in our Church music ought to be rendered by boys, and not by women, has spread throughout the length and breadth of the land, seizing on place after place almost like an epidemic.

The causes that have favoured its spread are: certain objections which it has become fashionable to make to the employment of women in choirs, and the desire for surpliced choirs, of which women cannot be members. Sometimes boys have been introduced into choirs at the suggestion of influential members of the congregation, who have heard the service at some cathedral, and, pleased with the singing of the boys, have thought that they ought to have boy singers at their own churches at home, forgetting that the singing of *their* boys will be very different from that of the cathedral boys whose performance pleased them so much. People also have assisted to spread the fancy by claiming for boys that they sing better than women.

Those who consider the singing of boys, speaking generally, to be greatly inferior to that of women, and believe that it

cannot, by any training, be rendered more than tolerable, and yet think that women ought not to sing in choirs, maintain that women do not look well in the chancel, and that the tone-quality of the female voice renders it unsuitable for use in church. They object that women occasionally behave with levity in church, often do not attend well, and often are hard to manage; and that it is generally difficult to maintain harmony when there are women in a choir. And some believe that women are prohibited in the Bible from singing in church choirs.

Those who contend for the great musical capabilities of boys and their superiority to women, point to the singing in cathedrals, which they declare is 'most magnificent.' Doubtless at many cathedrals and collegiate churches which have choir-schools attached to them, and at some very important parish churches, the boys sometimes sing excellently. But this, while it shows that boys may be effective singers when all the conditions are extremely favourable, does not prove them to be better singers than trained women. And the perfected singing of boys is not (cannot be) heard at most parish churches. The cathedral authorities are able to get good voices and keep up the succession, and the boys are trained and taught the elements of music by specialists, who understand their work, and can give ample time to it. The boys sing twice daily, and are always receiving instruction. They know that it is to their interest to make progress in music; and as they receive a free education and enjoy other advantages, they can be made to behave themselves. But all this is very different at the great majority of churches in country towns, where, as the conditions are less favourable, the singing is less satisfactory. Still less in villages does one expect to hear good singing by boys. And yet even in little villages chorister boys have made their appearance—the advocates for them apparently believing that boys with good voices are plentiful everywhere, and that capable trainers, who understand voice production and can teach singing, are to be found in every town and village in England. Strange delusion! In truth, boys with good voices are very scarce, and trainers with

sufficient skill and patience to make boys of the ordinary type sing even tolerably, are still rarer. Moreover, boys need daily practice. But it would be hardly possible to get them to come to practice every day, or to persuade their parents to send them, unless they were well paid, and it were very much to their worldly advantage to do so. But if good material were obtainable, and the boys were practised daily, and it were possible to secure the services of an able trainer, and such a person succeeded in developing their voices and teaching them their rudiments, no one could be sure that the boys would sing carefully, and their performance be tasteful and expressive.

Those who, while preferring the singing of women to that of boys, dislike to see women in the chancel (which they hold to be the proper place for the choir) are probably a numerous class. They think that the presence of the female element in the chancel is a violation of ecclesiastical propriety. No doubt the appearance in the chancel of a number of very gaily dressed women is objectionable; and attempts have been made to meet the difficulty (for it is a difficulty) by some who, knowing the superiority of women singers, have determined to retain them. Attempts have been made, and successfully in some places, to get all the women to wear dresses and bonnets of some plain colour. However, the presence of modest and quietly dressed women in the chancel does not seem objectionable.* If the choir occupied a west gallery—and there is no reason why it should not—it would not matter how the women were dressed.

The objection to women singers on the ground that the quality of the female voice renders it less fit for use in the Church services than boys' voices, is surely mere prejudice. The opinion that female voices impart a sensuous colouring to the music is too absurd to need refuting. Women's voices are indeed different as to tone-quality from boys', being less cold

* The writer is informed that at Roman Catholic churches the women, when the choir is in the chancel, are concealed by curtains or a screen of some kind. Those who, for any reason, dislike to see women singers in the chancel might copy this arrangement.

and penetrating, but fuller and more melodious. The writer recently heard a lady amateur say that she could listen with delight to the singing of a great soprano in oratorio, but would not like to hear her sing in church, because the female voice in church does not harmonize with the surroundings. And there are some who, while they hold that female voices ought not to be admitted into church choirs, kindly permit women to sing on festival occasions. With every desire to be candid, it is difficult to consider such opinions as these. It is surely a strange fancy that 'I know that my Redeemer' must not be sung in church unless a boy sings it—that while a singer of the first rank may, with propriety, sing this sublime air at the Albert Hall, she may not sing it in church, because her voice, by reason of its tone-quality, is not in harmony with the surroundings. And it is equally hard to believe that there is something so unchurchlike and profane in the quality of the female voice, that the choral singing of women, which delights us at musical festivals, so far from having a beautiful effect in church, sounds so much out of place in the sacred building that it must be banished therefrom at any cost.

The objection to women singers on the ground of levity, irregular attendance, and the difficulty of managing them and maintaining harmony among them is indeed a serious objection. Levity during Divine Service is an abomination that must be stopped, though sometimes it requires great tact to stop it. Probably most, if not all, women could attend well if they would. The writer knew a young woman, an excellent singer, who for seven years never missed a practice or a service when she was well and at home. But there is sometimes difficulty in getting careless or conceited women to attend well, though if an organist has influence he may do much to persuade. It generally happens in voluntary choirs where women are employed that some of them are hard to manage. The best singers, alas! are often conceited and impatient of correction. Easily offended themselves, they often sorely try the temper of the organist; and their jealousies and quarrellings—

Tantaene animis coelestibus irae?—

sometimes become a source of great trouble to him. Indeed, to control a voluntary choir, if there are many conceited or unamiable women in it, and to maintain harmony—nay, even to prevent a total disruption—requires very great tact and patience; and it has sometimes even been necessary to dismiss the more obstreperous females, if indeed their fancied wrongs have not already prompted them to leave of their own accord. These difficulties, however, hardly exist in choirs where the females are well-bred women, or some of the best singers are paid.

It is surprising to find people arguing from the Bible that women ought not to sing in church choirs. For women seem to have been employed in the Temple choir (see 1 Chron. xxv. 5, 6, and Ezra ii. 65, where 'two hundred singing men and singing women' are included among those who returned with Zerubbabel). And the singing of women does not seem to be forbidden in either the Old or the New Testament. The words of St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35, are strangely quoted by the advocates for boy singers, for they contain no injunction against women's singing. It is their *speaking* in church that is forbidden (see 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12, where they are forbidden to *teach*). Many passages in the Old Testament prove that the beauty of the female voice was recognised by the Jews; and there is no reason to suppose that women were prohibited from taking part in the musical portion of their services, or of those of the early Christian Church. We learn from Philo that choirs of men and women sang in the religious services of the Therapeutæ—a sect of Jewish enthusiasts of the first century after Christ. And Burney gives quotations from Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, which show that women sang in the early Christian assemblies.

Something has already been said of surpliced chancel choirs in Chapter I., Part II. To musicians it is not a matter of concern whether the singers wear surplices or not; and the surplice question is only mentioned here because a surpliced choir implies the substitution of boy singers for women. Surpliced choirs have been introduced at their churches by clergymen of very different schools. Ritualists gratify them-

selves and amuse their congregations with a brave show of surpliced, but (it must be confessed) often most unmusical choristers, robed in white to represent the Angelic choir, and skilled in all the arts of procession, recession, genuflexion, and prostration. And some Evangelicals, on the plea of 'decency,' have introduced the surplice; and (the real significance of the act never being suspected) clergymen who profess to abhor ritualism have taught their surpliced chancel choirs the eastward position.* Probably surpliced choirs have been introduced into many churches for no better reason than that congregations wished to be in the fashion, and did not care to be beaten by their neighbours who possessed one. They have probably been introduced at some places, because it was thought a surpliced choir might be a means of drawing people to church. If the singing of boys is greatly inferior to that of women, and women cannot be surpliced, then a surpliced choir is poorer (musically) than one in which women sing; and the advocates for surpliced choirs, since they set a greater value on surplices than on good singing, think Church music a matter of only second-rate importance. But the friends of music, finding they can have only one of two things, choose music, which they believe to be a greater ornament to the Church service and a more powerful incentive to devotion than surpliced choirs and processions of choristers. They do not believe surpliced choirs to be necessary to the reverent performance of Divine service. They are not anxious to

* These clergymen are very indignant when it is pointed out to them that they are copying the Ritualists. But if not for the sake of pomp and spectacle, or downright ritualism, why, it may be asked, do they depart from the old simple ways? Surely few of them would maintain that the music gains by the change—that the effect of a surpliced chancel choir and an organ crowded into a corner is better than that of a mixed choir and an organ in a roomy west gallery. The plea of 'decency' will weigh little with most thinkers, who will probably be of opinion that an imperfect rendering of the music by surpliced choristers is more indecent than the presence in the chancel of singers who wear only their ordinary garments. It is curious to learn that at some churches, at home and abroad, an attempt is made to combine music and 'decency' by retaining women and surplicing them.

follow fashion, when, to do so, they must sacrifice their music. They believe that if a surpliced choir often proves an attraction for a time, good music proves a far more permanent attraction. And, certainly, people do attend well at churches where the singing is good, and, perhaps, occasional anthems are given by good choirs.*

The modern and mediæval objections to women singers on the ground of ecclesiastical propriety are so light that they do not weigh a feather's weight, and it would be impossible (the writer believes) to prove that the use of female voices is forbidden in Holy Scripture. The objection that women cannot be robed in surplices weighs only with those who have adopted mediæval opinions, or who like the appearance of surpliced choirs so well that they will have them at any cost. The only real objections to the employing of women in choirs —and the objections obtain only in voluntary choirs, or when the women have been too hastily admitted—are the difficulty of managing some of them (the unamiable and conceited) and maintaining harmony among them, the difficulty of dealing with such as behave with levity, and the difficulty of getting some of them to attend regularly.

But, even if women were not greatly superior to boys as singers, the objections just mentioned ought not to be fatal to the employing of them. For if some women are difficult to manage, most boys are very troublesome. There is not much trouble in getting boys to attend practice, but it is excessively difficult to get and keep their attention. Their carelessness and thoughtlessness cause them to be very troublesome. If some women occasionally behave with levity during service, what shall be said of the behaviour of boys, which is seldom reverent, and sometimes truly disgraceful? Their restlessness and love of fun (prompting them sometimes to such diversions as pulling each other's surplices in church, and passing cotton-reels along a string) and their inclination to stare about and laugh and talk, make them, in the opinion of those who like decency and propriety, no desirable addition to a church choir.

* Assuming that the prayers are reverently read, and the sermons good and of reasonable length.

But 'boys will be boys.' As to disciplining them, few, except their schoolmasters, can do that. A man may be a splendid musician and an excellent teacher, and yet be unable to *manage* boys. He may not have enough firmness; perhaps he may suffer from some personal defect; or his appearance may be too mild, and his manner too gentle. And boys are not slow to find out when they may take advantage. There are, doubtless, men who can rule them by firmness and a kind manner, but it may safely be said that the ordinary choirboy is ruled by fear, not love. But an organist, besides being firm, must be possessed of an extraordinary amount of patience. Let him lose his temper, and his influence is gone; and though he have the voice of Stentor, to roar at the boys, a hundred eyes, like Argus, to watch them, and a hundred hands, like Briareus, to chastise them, he shall not recover it.

But boys are not only troublesome, they are untrustworthy. An organist may leave practice, hoping that all will go well on Sunday, and on Sunday some careless boy, or boys, may spoil all. Boys may know their work well enough to get through the service, and yet may make most dreadful mistakes. How often organists find the time and labour spent on the boys to have been wasted; how often their efforts are frustrated by the careless boys; and how frequently any artistic (and legitimate) effects they wished to introduce are spoiled by the thoughtless fellows! When women are employed, the organist's instructions are properly carried out, and clergymen and organists need not be afraid lest there be a catastrophe any moment.

That boys, if left to themselves, are not to be trusted—that their singing is unsatisfactory if unsupported by female voices—was soon discovered. People who had been accustomed to listen with pleasure to the careful and expressive singing of women, could not but be aware that it was greatly superior to the loose and unmusical performance of boys. And in many churches women are retained to 'help the boys.' There can be no objection to combining a *few* good and well-trained boys' voices with a good number of female voices in a choir; but it would be safest to forbid the boys to sing in anything

requiring a careful and expressive rendering. Unless they were very good, they ought to join only in full passages—as at the great burst, 'Thou art the King of Glory.' Their voices might be used as an organist treats a powerful reed-stop—which he does not use continually, but draws only when its tone and quality render its use desirable. In many places a few boys might be found who would be worth the trouble of training; and, being few, they would not be bad to manage. It is quite *unnecessary* to add any boys to a choir, but as some of them might eventually be useful as tenors and basses, the time spent on instructing a few boys would perhaps not be quite thrown away.

But if a very *few* boys, to sing only sometimes, might be added to the sopranos without spoiling a choir, the result is very different when—as is almost always the case—the boys are numerous and sing throughout the service. The harsh and piercing voices of the usually half-taught boys are heard through and above the more melodious voices of the women, blending as little with them as a 'screamy,' bad reed-stop blends with good diapasons. In many churches the boys are such careless, worthless musicians, that by their screaming,* dragging, hurrying, disregard of *piano* and *forte*, want of accord in starting, but, when once set off, tearing along like locomotive engines, false intonation, slurring, and bad pronunciation, they utterly spoil the performance of the women. In short, as boys generally are not to be depended on when alone, so, if at all numerous, they form no very valuable addition to a choir possessing female sopranos.

Boys, to be even tolerable, require a vast amount of labour and much valuable time (often ill spared) to be spent on them; and just as they are beginning to be useful, we lose them. In consequence of boys' voices breaking, it is necessary always to have a number of little boys in reserve. So that

* Few boys being able to sing high notes without straining their voices, it follows that at almost all churches where boy singers are employed many anthems, hymn-tunes, and chants are either never sung, or, if attempted, are rendered with false intonation and piercing screams that make musical people wish to close their ears.

there are two sets of boys to be looked after. What with the continual practising and drilling they require, and their carelessness, making it uncertain whether they will get through the services decently, or make some dreadful mistake any moment, boys are a source of endless trouble and anxiety to organists and clergymen and all who have to do with them.

Whatever may be thought of the singing of boys, when heard at their best, as they are in cathedrals and churches that possess costly musical establishments, the performance of boys is, as a rule, very far from satisfactory—nay, often it is most painful to listen to. Doubtless good and well-trained voices are heard sometimes even in country towns and village choirs; but such cases are quite exceptional.*

In the Preface to his Collection of Chants, Mr. Joule much doubts the 'expediency of depriving churches of the most lovely portion of the human register,' and points out that 'the old adage about the impossibility of placing old heads on young shoulders holds true in music as well as in other matters.' Mr. Joule reminds us that at the commencement of the seventeenth century, 'in consequence of the necessarily unsatisfactory performance of boys and *falsetti*, and the prejudice against the employment of women,' a new kind of soprano began to be used in the Pope's Chapel. Notions of ecclesiastical propriety forbade the employment of women; but, rather than employ boys in that celebrated choir, they had recourse to the most extraordinary means of obtaining sopranos. Pietro della Valle, the celebrated traveller (of whom Burney says: 'he had studied music under the best masters from seven years old, and seems to have been a perfect judge of the subject. His information and remarks are written with the spirit of an auditor, and discover a thorough knowledge of the subject'), wrote, in 1640, 'an in-

* The writer tried the boys' voices of a country parish church choir, and found that of the twelve boys six were worse than useless, three were very poor, two were barely tolerable, and *one was fairly good.* And with such material the worthy vicar of a town, locally noted for its good singing, had replaced the excellent female sopranos who led the psalmody so well!

teresting, clear, and admirable account of the state of music in Italy, but particularly at Rome, during the beginning of the seventeenth century.' Pietro della Valle says—and probably every unprejudiced judge and sincere lover of music nowadays will be of the good old writer's opinion—'The best resource then' [before the employment of the new order of soprani] 'was a boy with a good voice; but boys, the instant they begin to know their business, lose their voices, and it is allowed, even while they remain in their greatest perfection, that their performance, on account of their youth and inexperience, must inevitably be devoid of taste, judgment, and grace; indeed, it is generally so mechanical and unfeeling, that I hardly ever heard a boy sing without receiving more pain than pleasure.'

The following are the principal facts to be borne in mind in connection with our subject. Some women singers (the unamiable and conceited) are often troublesome, and require great tact to manage; a number of boys together are always very troublesome. Women are reliable; boys, because they are boys, are seldom to be depended on. Women may be trusted even with florid music (as anthems); boys sometimes fail in the simplest psalmody. With women for his supporters, an organist need know no fear; boys may go wrong any moment, and they are therefore a source of anxiety to clergymen and organists. Women with good voices are, in most places, easily procurable and need no great amount of teaching; boys with good voices are scarce and require endless labour to teach, and competent trainers are wanting. Women repay instruction, and generally sing excellently—often exquisitely; much valuable time and labour are often thrown away in teaching boys, and they seldom sing tolerably—often vilely.*

Though it is at present the fashion to remove women singers from choirs and substitute boys for them, choirs have not been improved, or the cause of Church music advanced,

* The worthlessness of boys is generally very perceptible in their response-singing. In the Litany especially, where music, if employed at all, should be perfectly rendered, their false intonation is very marked.

by the change. Those who have introduced the boy element into their choirs, can perhaps hardly be expected to confess that they have made a mistake. And many people, even if they notice the falling-off in Church music, regard it with little concern. But there are others who observe the degeneracy of Church choir singing, and know the cause of it; and these look forward to the day—and it will surely come—when the present fashion will give place to a better one, and women's voices (the most perfect and beautiful of all musical material) once more help to lead the praises of God in the sanctuary.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHOIR.

THERE are so many inexpensive treatises in existence which are written to teach the arts of voice-production, singing, and choir-training, that it will not be needful to say much on any of these subjects. But some remarks on Church choirs and choristers may perhaps not be deemed superfluous.

At a church where only the Canticles were sung and simple psalmody used, the school children in the gallery *might* lead the singing, in the absence of a regular choir. The importance of a knowledge of music is beginning to be recognised, and as grants are given to National schools that pass scholars in sight-singing, instruction is given in most places in the Tonic sol-fa, or even in the staff notation, which is far better. It seems as if we shall eventually have, in many towns and villages, a number of young musicians, who might, in some cases, do good service. Even now the children, if led by their teachers and supported by the organ, are able sometimes to sing simple Church music in a manner that would satisfy all but very critical persons. But if it were intended to have anything more than very simple music, a regular choir of men and women would be necessary, the chanting of the Psalms being beyond the powers of the children.

It is always desirable that there be some proportion between the parts of the harmony. If anthems and services are sung, or the service is choral, the voices cannot be too well balanced. Indeed, without a well-balanced choir of good and highly-trained voices, choral services and elaborate music

should never be attempted.* If good choral singing is desired, only people who are musical and have good voices should belong to the choir. Bad material is worse than useless. The efforts of a whole choir may be spoiled by one bad voice or untuneful singer. Such tares should be weeded out (it is strange that they should ever appear there; but the fact that unfit people are sometimes enrolled as choristers shows that no one should be admitted into a choir without the sanction of the organist). If really high-class singing is wanted, one or two singers of each part (four or eight in all) should be paid. This would be expensive; but well-rendered elaborate music is a luxury which people must be prepared to pay for. At parish churches in country towns the services of one professional soprano should, if possible, be secured, even if the Church service were not very elaborate. Such a singer would be simply invaluable. There are such differences in voices that it is impossible to say how many singers of each part a choir should have in order to be well balanced. But the parts will be well proportioned, numerically at least, if there are as many tenors as altos, while the basses are more numerous and the trebles the most numerous of all. If the treble is sung by boys or girls, a great number of them will be required. The only voices hard to get are altos, a sufficient number of which, of good quality, are seldom easily procurable. Although Mendelssohn is said to have 'hated your bearded altos,' the male alto is very valuable when good. He is intolerable, however, when bad. Female altos, or more properly, contraltos, often hoot, or are so soft as to be useless. Some authorities object—though, perhaps, without good reason—to employing both male and female altos in the same

* Even easy anthems should not be attempted unless they can be well rendered. For example, Goss's 'O taste and see' has been undertaken by many an inferior choir, though it really requires a well-taught choir, and musical voices, if justice is to be done to it. How often, and how miserably, has this delightful anthem been spoiled! If the members of the average surpliced choir *must* show their powers, let them be satisfied with some such composition as Jackson's 'Te Deum,' and not attempt a piece of good music, though it may seem easy.

choir. But whether this part be sung by altos or contraltos, or both, the voices should be chosen with a view to their blending with each other and with the other parts.

Since one quarrelsome person can do much to disturb the harmony of a choir, caution ought to be employed in admitting new members. It should also be ascertained that intending new members are people who would behave reverently during Divine service, and conduct themselves properly at practice. It is curious to note that in some places attention is beginning to be paid to the behaviour of singers *out of church*, and that a kind of cap with a badge has lately been introduced somewhere for the boys to wear. As for the conduct of the choristers out of church, it should be the business of the clergyman to see to that. Surely the reformers of choirs would not expect the organist to keep an eye on the singers, and see the boys wore their caps. But the behaviour of the choir at practices held in church and during Divine service is a serious matter, and one that it is the organist's duty to look to. While a sanctimonious manner is never desirable, the singers should be taught, by precept and example, that laughter and frivolous conduct at practice are improper, and that careless behaviour during service is highly indecent. If there are boys in the choir, it may supply matter for study to those who advocate them, how they may be kept quiet at practice and made to behave themselves during service. The writer will not soon forget going a little early to a practice at a fine parish church with the vicar, and the noise they heard as they drew near the sacred building, nor the look and remark of the vicar ('Boys, don't you know where you are?') when that gentleman opened the door and caught his favourites shouting and jumping about.

While all agree that singers should be 'respectable,' many differ as to the precise amount of 'respectability' required. While some would allow any decent, well-conducted person to sing, others would reject people who follow certain callings. Some think a choir should consist chiefly of the teachers at the parish schools, and some would have a select choir of ladies and gentlemen. A choir of ladies and gentlemen is

certainly pleasant and harmonious; and educated people pronounce English correctly. But whether such choirs generally sing as well, or attend as well, as choirs composed of persons belonging to a humbler grade, may be doubted. If a choir consisting chiefly of school-teachers with good voices could be formed, regular attendances might be expected, except in the holidays, which come precisely when a full attendance of singers is most needed.* As to the objections some have to asking people of certain callings to join a choir, the writer would not be inclined to admit any 'lewd fellows of the baser sort,' but he would not refuse the help of a singer who was well qualified, merely on the ground of his or her trade or calling.† At the same time, women that are excessively fond of finery should not be admitted into a choir which occupies the chancel. If the choir sit in a gallery, it matters not how the women are dressed.

Most people hold that singers should be people who lead regular lives, and though this opinion, like every other, may be ridiculed, it seems a very sound one. Men who frequent beer-houses, and women who lead frivolous lives, do not seem

* Though many of the teachers in our National and Infant schools know something of the rudiments of music, there is no reason to suppose that they generally possess good voices and are musically gifted. Indeed, if pupil teachers at the commencement of their career had good and tuneful voices, the loud calling during school hours would surely tend to spoil them. Besides, it certainly seems cruel to compel the hard-worked teachers to sing in the church choir, and a choir formed entirely or chiefly of pressed teachers would not render the Church music as well as another composed of singers who had good and fresh voices and gave their services willingly. But the cases in which the teachers are compelled to sing in the church choir are probably few, though the writer has heard of one clergyman who 'expects' all the teachers at the parish schools to join the choir—*whether they can sing or not.*

† The chief qualifications to be expected of intending choristers are a good voice and a good ear, a love of music, rhythmical perception, a fairly educated taste and pronunciation, and (when they can be had) some knowledge of singing, and ability to sing at sight from the staff notation. A good voice and an 'ear for music' are absolutely essential. An organist can give instruction in music and train the voice, but he cannot give musical perception and good vocal organs.

to be suitable material to make church choirs of. The necessity of using care in admitting fresh singers into choirs is insisted on in a Charge delivered in the Chapter House at Lichfield by the late Bishop: 'There is a danger,' said his lordship, 'against which we cannot too carefully guard as well in our parish churches as in our cathedral choirs—I mean the danger of enlisting the services of accomplished singers, or of beautiful voices, where they are associated with careless if not vicious lives. Surely our first care and our chief concern should ever be to make choice of those whose purity and piety mark them as fitted to lead the praises of the Church of God; and rather to be satisfied with less perfect voices than to bear the reproach of immoral lives.'

But some clergymen do not deem it sufficient that the singers shall be well-conducted, religious people. They appear to think that choristers should be persons who lead quite saintly lives; and in order to exclude all who do not come up to their standard, apply that most dangerous of modern inventions the 'communicant test.' Of the many extreme views on Church music that are at present floating about, that which insists on choristers having attained to an especial degree of holiness is surely not the least absurd. Some excellent men (clergymen and laymen) there are, who carry their theories so far, that they will not go to hear oratorios performed because (say they) it grieves them to hear sacred music sung by unconverted people. They believe that many people in the chorus must be unconverted. While their scruples are intelligible enough, it may be answered that these objectors trouble themselves unnecessarily. Every person in the chorus *may* be converted. How can a stranger be sure that such is not the case; and why should he speculate upon the matter? It is probable enough that the evil are mingled with the good in an oratorio chorus, as they are everywhere else; and it must be confessed that a performance of the 'Hallelujah' and 'Worthy is the Lamb' by a large band and chorus, of which every member is converted, is not very likely to be often heard on earth. But surely we ought not to omit even those two peculiarly solemn numbers, when the 'Messiah' is given,

because an earthly, and not a heavenly choir must sing them. To the writer it seems strange that anyone can listen to a worthy rendering of these sublime choruses, and be so little moved that he can estimate the number of converted and unconverted people he has before him.*

If it is desirable that choristers should be men and women 'whose purity and piety mark them as fitted to lead the praises of the Church of God,' how much care should be taken in selecting singers to render *solos*—how necessary it is that they should be men and women of pious conversation. However exquisitely they may sing, it is painful to listen to a rendering of sacred solos by men and women that we know to be wanting in principle, or perhaps utterly careless about religion. To all thoughtful people it must be intolerable to hear such words as, 'Thy rebuke hath broken his heart,' 'Behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto His sorrow,' or 'Who may abide the day of His coming?' sung in the sanctuary by a base, unprincipled man; or to listen to an irreligious woman rendering 'O rest in the Lord,' or 'But the Lord is mindful of his own.' The writer was assured by one of the choristers that, at a church in the North of England, there was once a tenor singer who delighted the congregation with his rendering of solos, and especially of the anthem, 'Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way,' and that it was this man's practice to read novels during the sermon! That such men (and women) should sing solos in church and find people to speak rapturously of their performance, is no encouraging sign for people who wish well to choirs and choristers.

Two mistakes are often made: choirs attempt music that is too hard for them; or, being already small, are divided in order that they may sing antiphonally. It is not edifying to a congregation to hear a choir struggling through difficult music. It is better they should take an easy piece and do it well, than attempt one that is beyond their strength and spoil

* Of most people, happily, it may be said that such strains

'Dissolve *them* into ecstasies,
And bring all Heaven before *their* eyes.'

it. A small choir is too weak to sing with effect if divided. The ambitious desire of choirs to undertake music that is too difficult for them, and to sing antiphonally, when they are not numerous enough, should not be yielded to.

The chanting and the psalmody should not be taken at a racing speed, nor should they be dragged or drawled. The sense of the words often determines the pace of the singing.* The stately old psalm-tunes should be taken at a slow pace, a pause being made at the end of each strain.

As the singing of the choir as a whole cannot be good unless each part be well rendered, in learning new tunes or practising old ones, the altos, tenors, and basses should be taken separately, and then together. If these parts can sing correctly without the trebles, it is a proof that they know their work. The whole choir should be able to sing the tunes without the help of the organ, and learn every piece so well that they may attack all the music boldly, and sing without fear or hesitation. If boys are admitted into the choir, they will need to be frequently practised separately in psalmody and the rudiments of music.

The singers should be taught, little by little, the rudiments of music. If once fairly started, they will make progress, and in due time gain the power of reading at sight. Sight-reading, always useful, is nearly indispensable when choirs have to render anthems, or, indeed, any music more elaborate than simple psalmody. If the fine old cathedral anthems are to be given, the altos and tenors should learn their respective C clefs. The singers should be taught to pay attention to intonation, pronunciation,† breathing, phrasing, expression,

* In chanting, punctuation and accentuation must be attended to, and the bad habits of hurrying over and imperfectly articulating words or syllables, and laying undue stress on the accented syllable in the recitation, must be corrected. To chant well, the choristers should read well. Good readers will make better chanters than people who cannot read with expression.

† To be corrected are such provincialisms as the change of *oi* into *i* ('rejice' for 'rejoice'), the changes, met with in Cumberland and Westmorland, of *o* into *aw*, and *a* into a sound something like *aa* in 'Aaron' ('hawly' for 'holy,' 'daa' for 'day'), the Leicestershire changes of *i*

and the other requisites of good singing, and especially to avoid those two very opposite vices, over-straining the voice and humming. As the church does not seem the proper place for teaching the rudiments of music, the instruction in these subjects might be given in the schoolroom or at the organist's house.

It is not uncommon to meet with people who say they dislike solos in church. But it is hard to see why solos should be deemed unsuitable, if anthem-singing of any kind is permitted. Solo-singing, indeed, sometimes causes a bad feeling in choirs, and there are many who think it tends rather to minister to the vanity of the singers than to excite the devotional feeling of the hearers. Certainly, caution should be exercised in admitting anthems with solos. But it would be absurd to lay down a law prohibiting all solos. If there were in a choir ladies of culture and soul enough to render such airs as 'O thou that tellest,' 'He was despised,' 'I know that my Redeemer,' there seems no reason why they should not occasionally sing such solos as these. At the same time, it solos were at all secular in style, or the singers were wanting in devotional feeling, they would be better omitted. What has been said about lady solo singers applies equally to tenors and basses. There are some sacred airs for the tenor voice which are truly expressive of devotion, and these might be sung sometimes, if the singer were a fit and proper person to render

into *oi*, and *ee* into *i* ('aroise, shoine' for 'arise, shine,' 'ship' for 'sheep'), etc. But mispronunciation often arises from carelessness ('wrychusnuss' for 'righteousness,' 'hands' for 'hand'). The most intolerable, however, as also the most common, mispronunciation is that which results from affectation. In some places the choristers have two pronunciations: the rough or natural one, in which they speak, and a refined or affected one, which they use when they sing. The same Cumberland choristers, who in conversation call 'holy' 'hawly,' often pronounce this word 'howly' when they sing it. 'Know' when said is 'gnaw'; when sung, 'now.' 'Awake' and 'to-day' in conversation are 'awaak' and 'to-daa'; while in singing they become 'aweighk' and 'to-deigh.' Similarly 'mine' and 'might' in some parts of the country are said as 'moin' and 'moight,' but sung as 'meighn' and 'meight,' etc. These mispronunciations are sometimes very distressing, *e.g.*: 'Sow that the san shall not barn thee beigh deigh, neither the mewn beigh neight.'

them. But if it happened that there was no one in the choir who could undertake them, but that obnoxious mass of conceit and vanity, the petted and pampered Tenor who occasionally is found in choirs, it would be better to omit them. It may, perhaps, be worth saying, that if solo-singing in church is a little in disfavour in England, it seems to be appreciated in America. A newspaper recently stated that in one of the large towns a woman was receiving £1,500* a year for singing in a church, and this when clergymen were walking about the streets unemployed!

Singers are generally supposed to be difficult people to deal with. Some people, indeed, seem to consider a voluntary choir as a magazine of combustibles, ready to blow up at a moment's warning. There is probably in *some* choirs a quantity of inflammable matter, which, in the case of a voluntary choir, burns fiercely if once ignited. In the case of paid choirs, there are means of checking the fire, which may, however, smoulder a long time. Among the causes of unpleasantness in choirs may be mentioned the vanity and insolence of pet singers, the interference of people who *will* meddle, solo-singing, contentions for precedence, and quarrels about seats, the strange propensity some people have to consider themselves slighted, and the mischief caused by persons who are not content with merely singing, but think they ought to direct. But unpleasantness may sometimes be traced to very trivial causes. Perhaps the organist has asked a singer to change his seat, or something he has said has been misunderstood; or perhaps a stranger has been asked to sing at a choir concert. Lately a choir 'struck' because the clergyman refused to allow the women to wear surplices. But it holds true of choristers as of other people, that the well-bred are pleasant to work with, but the rest often haughty and easily offended. The writer believes that unpleasantness might often be avoided, if singers would only tell their grievances to the organist as they arose, and not brood over them. It is on every account desirable that this officer should have influence with the choir. This he can only acquire by maintaining his position among

* Surely dollars, and not pounds sterling, must be meant!

them. Choirs do not respect a weak government, nor do they cheerfully follow the instructions of an organist who has not the regard and support of the vicar.

Sometimes choirs will threaten to leave if they cannot have something they ask for. If the request is reasonable, it should be granted; if not, the clergyman should not yield. While everyone is obliged to the singers for their valuable help, and recognises the self-denial they must exercise to attend regularly, it is not possible always to comply with their wishes. Threats would seldom be carried out, if clergymen gave the singers to know that those who left should not return. Choristers are proud of their position—and with reason—and they would not, for an imaginary grievance, leave a choir if they knew they could not return to it. Some perhaps might leave, but certainly many would remain. But if a whole choir 'struck,' the clergyman should be firm (the writer ventures to think) and direct the organist to set about forming another choir. For several Sundays the music would necessarily be very simple. The first Sunday it might perhaps be limited to the singing of a few well-known hymns; but, by the following Sunday, it would be possible to chant the Canticles. Chanting the Psalms would come later. An energetic organist, if supported by the clergyman and his friends, would fill the empty benches with good singers in less time than might be supposed. The writer has entered into this subject, because he believes that singers who threaten to leave for an imaginary grievance should not be pressed to stay.

PART IV.

THE CHOICE AND DIRECTION OF THE MUSIC.

'He instructed about the song, because he was skilful.'
1 Chron. xv. 22.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH MUSICAL STAFF.

A PROVINCIAL newspaper, in an account of the opening of an organ, stated that the Church service commenced with a 'procession of the choir, headed by the sub-precentor.' At this church, it appears, the music is managed by a number of officers: there are an organist, a choirmaster, a precentor, and a sub-precentor. The authorities have only to increase the number by appointing a sub-organist and a sub-choirmaster and their church will have probably the largest staff of musical officers in the world. In most places the management of the music is placed in the hands of one musician, the organist; but at the little town of —— they employ a numerous staff of Church musicians, probably because the lady-organist is considered to be unable to train the choir, and unfit to choose the music. But this church is not the only one at which precentors and choirmasters are found, and the tendency at present is to create more and more of such officers. Even at churches where the organists are good Church musicians, curates or 'precentors' sometimes choose the music, and separate 'choirmasters' instruct the choirs.

When an organist is unfit to select the music and unable to train the choir, the help of a precentor and choirmaster is doubtless needed. It is discouraging that there should be such organists, but the appointment of unqualified persons to organistships is sometimes unavoidable. There are places where the organist's salary is poor, and pupils are not to be had. And as the clergymen cannot expect artists to take such appointments, they must be satisfied to have their organs

played by inferior musicians.* But poor organists (with precentors and choirmasters to select the music and direct the choir) are sometimes appointed to positions where there is 'teaching,' and the salaries of the organist and choirmaster, if combined, would make a sum large enough to enable the authorities to engage a good organist. Sometimes organists have been appointed because 'the salary would be useful to them,' or the authorities wished to reward persons who have worked in the parish. The feeling that prompts the gift is kind; but when a clergyman appoints an organist that he knows to be unqualified, he does his congregation a wrong; and it is absurd to appoint such a person when the services of a better might be had. Further, it is unjust to those who live by practising music, to appoint an amateur to a situation, where the salary and teaching would support a professional musician. To judge from advertisements that appear from time to time, and from statistics that have lately been published, there is no lack of amateur organists, who combine organ-playing with less musical pursuits. There are merchant-organists, lawyer-organists, schoolmaster-organists, Scripture-reader-organists, clerk-organists, gardener-organists, traveller-organists (other than they of the *Orgues de Barbarie*), shopmen-organists, grocer-organists. All these, and many more, claim to be organists,

'And *have their* claims allowed.'†

* In remote country places, where an organist of skill and knowledge cannot be had, the parish schoolmaster would seem quite the best person to discharge the duties of choirmaster. He is always highly respectable, often possesses some little knowledge of music, and is almost necessarily a good disciplinarian.

† The writer some time since attended service at two parish churches where the organists were clerks. While they possessed mechanical skill enough to carry them through the services (which were not elaborate), want of intelligence and of artistic and devotional feeling was very apparent in both these so-called 'organists.' The voluntaries, evidently chosen for their 'popular' character, were Choruses of Angels, Marches of Torches and of Trumpets, and other unchurchlike compositions. But such as they were, the clerks played them much better than the accompaniments, which were poor indeed. At one church the player scarcely

Among the better class of amateurs there are doubtless some good musicians, whose love of music prompts them to cultivate the organ. But however well qualified these gentlemen may be, they ought to be satisfied with practising and deputizing. There are exceptions; but, as a rule, no amateur should accept an appointment, if by so doing he prevents a professional organist from making a livelihood. Of the other class of amateurs it is unpleasant to speak, since they are often quite incompetent, and anxious only to pocket the salaries their musical betters ought to have. A great musician,

ever varied his stops, but accompanied in a tasteless, inexpressive manner. At the other, the 'organist' *did* vary his stops, but only to introduce paltry flourishes on the Flute and Clarionet stops. Prompted by some curiosity, the writer inquired if the last-mentioned player *always* added those additional accompaniments, and learned that this nimble-fingered youth not only constantly indulged his propensities for 'tootling,' but after any unusual display would turn round with a satisfied and conceited smile, and look at the choir as if he thought he had done a very clever thing. But it is probable that neither of these organists ever had a good organ-lesson in his life. Both of them played in a bouncing, thumping, *staccato* style, not knowing (how should they?) that good organ-playing requires the use of the *legato* style, in which the notes are smoothly bound together. But, it may be objected, some young and inexperienced professional organists are not better musicians than many amateurs, and possess no more taste. No doubt there are professors who know little of the theory and practice of music, and one is compelled to admit that some young professionals show a great want of judgment in the choice of their voluntaries. The writer has even heard one of them play for his concluding voluntary a piece in which the loud and rapid performance of the chromatic scale was the most remarkable feature. Indeed, the incompetent or the ignorant professional has little reason to sneer at the accomplished amateur. But while amateurs who have enjoyed the advantage of sound instruction sometimes excel as instrumentalists, the number of good amateur organists probably is only small. It is perhaps worth adding that amateurs generally have neither the same chances of improving themselves nor the same incentives to exertion as professionals, who see more of musicians and musical work, and are condemned without mercy if the organ-playing and choir-singing at the churches where they officiate is not satisfactory. It may in this place be said that the good work done by the College of Organists—an examining body comprising such eminent men as Dr. Turpin and his worthy coadjutors—must tend to develop the musical skill and knowledge of professional organists.

speaking of the appointment of such persons to posts that ought to be filled by professional men, said: 'These men sell treacle six days in the week, and on the seventh day wash their hands and place them on the keys of an organ; and, of course, when the keys are pressed down, the pipes must speak.' So long as such appointments continue to be made, it will be necessary that special officers be engaged to direct Church music. But when choirs possess good organists, the help of precentors and choirmasters is not needed.

All, however, are not of this opinion. The Rev. Dr. Troutbeck says three officers—the precentor, the choirmaster, the organist—constitute a theoretically perfect staff, though 'two officers are generally sufficient for the complete performance of the necessary duties. They may be either: 1, precentor and choirmaster: 2, organist; or 1, precentor; 2, organist and choirmaster. The former of these two combinations will be found useful where the organist is inexperienced or unskilful, and one of the clergy of the parish, or a qualified layman, can take the position of precentor and choirmaster. The latter of the two combinations generally works the best, one of the parochial clergy acting as precentor, with the powers and duties already described, the organist being the teacher, conducting all the practices, and acting as chief authority in purely musical matters.' Of the precentor Dr. Troutbeck says: 'The selection of the music, and the disciplinary control of the choir, should be in his hands, even if he is not possessed of sufficient technical knowledge of music to be the referee on purely musical points. In most parishes one of the parochial clergy executes what remains of the precentor's office. The power of admitting to the choir and of dismissing from it, is sometimes exercised by the precentor. Admission and dismissal, however, are matters in which the incumbent of the parish should have the chief voice.' And of the choirmaster: 'The choirmaster, when there is one, ought to be in fact the teacher, and the conductor of all the practices; while the organist should be strictly the accompanist, his services being generally given at full practices only.' In this system there is always a precentor to select the music,

and sometimes a choirmaster to direct the choir. The organist never selects the music. The precentor is the chief luminary of the system, and the organist a satellite revolving round the greater planet. And if there be a separate choirmaster, the organist will virtually be governed by that officer also. So that the organist is an officer of only second or third rate importance. Now, all this would be well enough, if organists were always inexperienced or unskilful. But when an organist is a good musician, surely it is absurd to make him an officer of inferior importance. Certainly he is, or ought to be, the 'chief musician.' The services of precentors and choirmasters may be dispensed with at churches where the organists are good all-round men. But organists are absolutely necessary, if we are to have congregational music in our churches.

Some people think that musical skill and learning does not necessarily qualify a man to select the music for use in church; since, they say, a musician may be a good performer and theorist, and yet want taste. And some fear that if organists selected the music, they might choose such as was either too elaborate, or unsuitable for the churches at which they officiated. A clergyman once said that 'he would not allow his organist, even if he were a Doctor of Music, to choose the music.' But surely, few would seriously maintain that good organists are so deficient in taste as not to know which chants best suit the expression of the Psalms and Canticles, which tunes best suit the sense of the hymns. And it is impossible to believe that an organist who possessed common-sense would choose music that was either too difficult, or did not suit the kind of service used at the church where he officiated. Some are of opinion that separate choirmasters are absolutely necessary to train choirs and preside at the choir practices. But this is not the case. A good organist, who knows his work, can not only train a choir, but also conduct the practices perfectly well. During a great part of the practice, he need not be at the organ, but may let the choir sing without the organ, and give them his undivided attention. All experienced organists know how to conduct choir practices, each after his own fashion.

Experience teaches that the system of employing a number of officers to manage the music of churches, however well it may sound in theory, fails when reduced to practice. Precentors and choirmasters, whether they know their business or not, are not only useless at churches where the organists are good general practitioners, but often worse than useless. Doubtless some precentors, lay and cleric, are well qualified to do their work; but generally, it is to be feared, these officers are too ignorant of the theory and practice of music—too little acquainted with musical matters to choose music and teach choirs. 'In most parishes one of the parochial clergy executes what remains of the precentor's office.' A clergyman is respected for his position and learning; but he falls immensely when he quits his position and undertakes what he cannot do well. Few curates are good musicians. Certainly their education does not qualify them to take a leading part in musical matters. A man may be a classical and mathematical scholar, and yet not be a musician. He may have no musical feeling, and if he is 'not possessed of sufficient technical knowledge of music to be the referee on purely musical points,' he cannot be fit, as a good organist is fit, to choose music for other people to sing. He must make mistakes sometimes. Even cathedral precentors probably have not always been able to dispense with the help of professional musicians. Good organists must find it trying to be obliged to play the music precentors choose, and there must be friction sometimes. And it must be equally objectionable, and likely to lead to unpleasantness, when a good organist finds himself obliged to adapt his accompaniment to the views of a choirmaster, whose ideas of light and shade and *tempo* are perhaps of the crudest. An organist cannot play a loud organ when the choir are singing softly. If the music is to be even tolerable, there must be accord between the singers and the accompanist. So that he must either accommodate himself to the views of the choirmaster, which must be annoying to an artist, or play to please the choirmaster at practice, and himself on Sunday. If, determined to infuse the correct expression into the music, he does the latter, the

choir will almost certainly follow him; but there will be serious unpleasantness between him and the choirmaster, which could not occur if there were no choirmaster.

But while most people will concede that it is useless, and worse than useless, to employ ignorant people at churches where the organists are good musicians and able to select the music and train the choirs, some have thought that if *competent* precentors and choirmasters were employed to work with good organists, the result would be satisfactory, and harmony, in two senses, secured. Experience teaches that just the contrary is the case. An organist who is a good all-round man can select the music and train the choir as well as any precentor or choirmaster can. And where there are such organists, the employment of these officers is unnecessary. It is not well to have a number of musical officers: it is much better that the work should be in the hands of only one man, than be shared by two or three. Even if their duties were always as clearly defined as they are in Dr. Troutbeck's treatise, it is hardly possible that two or three men could be engaged in managing the music at the same church, and not differ sometimes. Even at cathedrals, where one looks for the best precentors, there has not always been perfect harmony when these gentlemen have had a voice in the selection and management of the music, but friction and even grave misunderstandings have arisen. 'Many men, many minds,' is an adage that is as true in music as in everything else. Musical opinions often are dependent on the taste of those who advance them, and therefore admit of no proof. Nothing is easier than for misunderstandings to arise between men who hold musical appointments at the same church, and nothing is more difficult than to reconcile musical officers between whom a coolness exists, for they are more prompt to take offence than eager to forgive. But if good organists are unable always to work in harmony with good precentors, they agree no better with good choirmasters. There are too many points on which a good organist and a good choirmaster will hold different opinions, and neither officer will confess the other's views to be better than his own. Discussions often lead

to unpleasantness. If the choirmaster is 'the teacher and the conductor of all the practices,' and the organist is 'strictly the accompanist,' the latter is practically under the direction of the choirmaster, and cannot claim to have a voice in the management of the music. However tasteful and judicious an accompanist, he is little more than a mere machine, for he must sink his own ideas of tone and pace, and adopt those of the choirmaster. It must be trying to a good man to feel that his skill and knowledge are useless, and a little irritating to be compelled to carry out the views of a man whom he considers to be a useless officer. It is possible that two or three men, all excellent musicians, might be engaged in the music at the same church, and all be so sweet-tempered that they would never quarrel; but, generally speaking, the employing of so many musicians is not likely to promote harmony, or prove a source of comfort to an incumbent.

Our subject might be pursued farther, but however far we went, we should arrive at the following conclusions: 1. One sound, practical musician is worth much more to a church than two or three pretenders. 2. When a parish will support a teacher, the organistship, becoming vacant, should be given to a professional man. 3. Organists' appointments might be made more valuable, if the offices of organist and choirmaster were united, and the salaries combined. 4. Precentors and choirmasters, competent or incompetent, are not required when organists are good all-round men, and the employment of them is almost sure to lead to friction and unpleasantness. 5. As there are good organists who are not equal to disciplining and training the voices of boys, officers to do this work would be useful where there are boy choristers, though in most places it would certainly be difficult to find competent trainers. Such officers should be regarded as specialists, and not have a voice in the selection or direction of the music. Their duties would be to take charge of the boys, and practise and drill them; they might also look to their behaviour at practice and service. 6. Curates, if they wished to help with the music, might do useful work by attending the choir practices, where their presence would be a check on

any singers that were disposed to be careless. (Organists might courteously avail themselves sometimes of the friendly help of the curates, who, however, even if good musicians, should not impede progress at practice by offering their opinions, unless asked to do so.) 7. The rubrics allow certain portions of the service 'to be said or sung,' and as incumbents are responsible for the proper rendering of Divine service, it is most reasonable that they should decide—and they can insist on doing so—which parts of the service shall be sung, and which read. Having decided this, they would do well to place the choir and the direction of the music in the hands of their organists; since, if they were good, practical musicians and men of taste, they would do the work better than anyone else.

CHAPTER II.

THE CLERGY AND CHURCH MUSIC.

IT is proposed, as far as may be possible in a limited space, to take a somewhat comprehensive view of a subject which, though often discussed, has generally been regarded from one-sided points of sight, and by persons whose feelings have rendered them unable to see the thing in its various aspects. Misunderstandings between clergymen and organists about the choice of the music used in the Church services, and the management of the music, are not now of very frequent occurrence; still, they occur, and are sometimes attended with unhappy consequences. Organs have been closed, and congregations deprived of instrumental music; parishes have been in an uproar; rival organists have struggled for the possession of an organ-stool; and, in one of our colonies, an organ is actually said to have been gas-tarred—things which, while they seem ludicrous enough to all who are not concerned in them, are doubtless felt to be most unpleasant by the disputants themselves. A slight want of judgment on the part of a clergyman or an organist may bring on a misunderstanding, which may rapidly become a very serious affair. Sometimes organists, forgetting the position of their clergymen, have looked with mistrust upon the interest they take in the Church music, and have been too ready to misconstrue a kindly-meant suggestion into an act of interference; and clergymen, ignoring the superior musical attainments of their organists, have not always treated these servants of the Church considerately. And so a coldness has arisen between those who should have worked together in harmony.*

* Many organists demonstrate a bad feeling towards the clergy, and are loud in denouncing them. While some of them have reason to

The problem to be solved is this: How shall it be arranged that the organist shall, in a proper and responsible manner, be allowed to direct the music, and yet the clergyman maintain his position in the church? Here are two parties concerned, and if a right understanding between them is ever to be arrived at, any arrangement that may be suggested must clearly meet the views of both. The question is of such importance that it ought to be seriously discussed.

In his own church the clergyman's power is absolute: it is, indeed, so great that it cannot be greater. All the organist's power is derived from the clergyman, and it is a mistake to suppose that an organist has any power or authority whatever by virtue of his office. The clergyman can say whether certain parts of the service shall be sung or not; and as he is responsible for the proper performance of Divine service, it is reasonable that he should have this power. The law, therefore, is good, for it strengthens the hands of the clergyman when he most needs support. But surely it can never have

complain of inconsiderate treatment received at the hands of their particular clergymen, the bad and disloyal feeling exhibited by these decriers of the clergy probably arises in most cases from their not being allowed to do just as they wish. Young organists have sometimes been so lauded by their admirers that they have become very conceited. It is the aim of such men to introduce more and more music into public worship. If they can persuade excessively amiable clergymen to let them alter the character of the Church services, their gratification knows no bounds. The praise they receive for their musical performance ministers to their already overweening vanity. If these men take other posts as organists, they expect to rule over their new clergy and congregation. They are impatient of control; and should their attempts to turn the Church service into a musical performance be firmly resisted, they at once discover that their clergymen are the enemies of Art. They even fancy that they are hostile to them personally, and consequently not men who should be regarded as friends and served loyally, but as tyrants who should be held up to public reprobation. Older and more experienced organists, led by the one-sided statements of their younger brethren, instead of pointing out the proper line of conduct, often condole with them on their fancied grievances. The feeling created by all this conversation, and a plentiful newspaper correspondence, seems to be so bad and so widespread, that it may almost be said that 'every *pastor* is an abomination to *organists*.'

been intended by the framers that clergymen should choose and direct the music in their churches without having the necessary musical qualification for so doing. Much less could it have been supposed that clergymen, practically ignorant of music, would perform the duties of musical directors, when churches were supplied with trained artists of skill and culture. However, the law places great power in the hands of the clergyman, which he may use either for good or for evil. If applied to control a foolish organist, who was disposed to give way to his extravagant fancies, it would be a wise use of the power. No doubt there have been organists who would have chosen very unsuitable music, perhaps merely to show off themselves or their choirs, and given annoyance to the congregation, if there had not been a power to control them. But, on the other hand, it would be a foolish abuse of power to apply it where its exhibition was uncalled for.

Since the law, then, gives power to the clergyman and none to the organist, it must be evident that contention with a clergyman about the choice of the tunes or the direction of the music is useless. A clergyman, if his organist persisted in disobeying him, might stop the contention by closing the organ, and (if the appointment rested solely with him) he might dismiss the organist. If the appointment rested with others the result would be a very painful dispute, in which the organist, if a 'popular' man, would have the sympathy of the congregation generally, and probably of the wardens, while the clergyman would be supported by his own more intimate friends. If the well-wishers of the organist gained the day their victory would be fruitless, for the clergyman could order the organ to be kept closed. The organist must be worsted in an encounter with the clergyman, and contention is to be deprecated. It would be better for him to resign his appointment (if it could not be retained with comfort) than resist the lawful authority of the clergyman. A qualified and conscientious artist, if he found himself the organist of a certain kind of clergyman, would feel disgusted and unhappy.* It

* The writer would be sorry if he were understood to mean that there are many such clergymen. But there have unquestionably been some who have treated their organists in a most arbitrary fashion.

would be painful to the man, and degrading to the artist, to be forced to teach and play music that his educated musical taste could not approve. He would not work *con amore;* his capacity for usefulness would be largely destroyed; and, his merit under-rated and his talent unacknowledged, his experience held at nothing, himself neglected and treated as a mere machine, he would probably be glad to be rid of his appointment at almost any sacrifice. But if unable from pecuniary considerations to resign, he must sink the artist and quietly do the bidding of the clergyman and his friends. The position of this worthy man now is truly deplorable. His principle prompts him to throw up his situation, but want of means compels him, if possible, to retain it. He is, of course, dissatisfied and unhappy; perhaps he murmurs, and the clergyman is told of it by someone who courts his favour. Our worthy organist may try as far as possible to make the best of his position and go on quietly, but his temper, if too much tried, may at last break down, and an explosion will probably be remembered against him. If presently he gives up his appointment, his chances of securing another depend in no small measure upon the reference his clergyman gives him. Our organist may find himself awkwardly placed, if the clergyman has brought himself to believe him to be an assuming, troublesome fellow.

The uselessness having been shown of contending with a clergyman determined to 'have his own way,' and some of the probable results of such contention touched upon, it may be asked how it comes about that some clergymen, when they have able and tried organists, in whom confidence might safely be placed, nevertheless direct and choose the music themselves. There have been clergymen distinguished in the art. The first organ-builders and organists were priests; and among illustrious clerical theorists, composers, and organists may be mentioned the names of Martini, Vogler, Stadler, Steffani, and our own Aldrich and Creyghton. Clergymen may also point with pride to an eminent living clerical musician.* Doubtless

* The late Sir Frederick Ouseley, who was living when these words were written.

there are clergymen with good musical taste, as there are organists without it; but as only very few clergymen have had a musical training, the great body are necessarily unfit to direct musical operations, much more so to direct musicians. It is very right that a clergyman should determine *how much* music shall be sung in the service, but if the organist be competent and trustworthy the choice of that music should be left to *him*. Which is the more likely to judge of the merits and effectiveness of a musical composition, and the ability of the choir to sing it, an organist who has given his time to the study of such matters, or a clergyman who is practically unacquainted with music? The clergyman would decide whether an anthem were verbally suitable to the occasion or not, but there his knowledge would end. If the clergyman chose the anthem without consultation with the organist, then it might happen that a poor musical composition might be selected, or an anthem which required a fine and well-balanced choir to render it properly might have to be done by an inferior choir, the result in either case being torture to the musical portion of the congregation and general dissatisfaction, the organist, who from the first had foreseen the failure and pointed out the impracticability of the attempt, being blamed. Again, simply because some clergymen believe that *solo* anthems are objectionable, only full anthems are allowed in their churches. It seems hard to believe that any arguments could show the undesirableness or impropriety of an expressive and devotional rendering in church of such solos as 'O rest in the Lord,' or 'I know that my Redeemer.' The question is not whether anthems shall be sung or not: that is for the clergymen to decide. But a clergyman having decided that an anthem may be sung, it is hard to understand why one that requires twenty voices to render it should be considered admissible, and another, simply because it must be sung by only one voice, discarded, granting it to be sung by a proper and duly qualified person.

In almost every case clergymen, by troubling themselves about the music, defeat their own purposes. Unquestionably, they would best insure having good music by securing the

services of good and reliable organists, and then leaving the choir and the direction of the music in their hands. If clergymen say that their organists are unqualified, it may be replied that the fault is, perhaps, their own. From motives of benevolence or personal regard, or a desire to reward a person who has helped in a parish, or with a view to saving the church the salary a good organist expects,* they sometimes appoint persons whose general artistic incapacity and ignorance of the duties of an organist render them unfit for the post. It is then found necessary that someone be appointed choirmaster, and probably the clergyman or some member of his family chooses the music. The curate does all he can to help, and perhaps ladies in the congregation give the church the benefit of what knowledge they possess. The result in such cases is bad or lukewarm singing, to the feeble, expressionless accompaniment of a sadly ill-used organ. What one good head could have done proves to be too much for all this host.

Not only is it unnecessary for a clergyman who has a good organist to trouble himself with the music, but a good organist will work all the better if made responsible for the music and allowed to manage it with method. But, remembering the clergyman's position, an organist should not be too ready to take offence at any kindly meant suggestions he may offer from time to time, or look upon such as interference. Most clergymen have their favourite tunes, and it would be a compliment to the clergyman, and a good thing in itself, if the organist could now and then introduce these into the services. To say that a tune is bad or unsuitable, simply because the clergyman likes it, is mere pettishness, and likely to lead to speedy trouble.

If their love of music prompts some clergymen to trouble themselves about their music, others are led to do so by a feeling that they are *responsible* for the services. A clergyman who was an excellent preacher and an excellent man, but

* A society which helps to supply churches with curates requires, when its aid is asked for a church, to know how much that church expends on its music. This must often have an injurious effect on Church music.

only a poor musician, once said that he so strongly felt this responsibility that it was a matter of principle with him to choose all the music that was used in his church, and added, quite seriously, that so far from being disposed to concede any power to his organist, he would not allow him to choose the chants or hymn-tunes, or to change them, without his express permission. A clergyman may be responsible for the music in his church, but surely a 'cure of souls' implies other and far greater responsibilities. Would not a clergyman best fulfil *all* his responsibilities by devoting himself to clerical work, strictly so called, and placing the musical arrangements in the hands of a good and reliable organist, who would best know how to deal with musical matters? Such an organist would not be likely to introduce anything unseemly or unsuitable into the Church services, and might safely be made 'responsible' for the musical portion of the services.

Besides the clergyman himself, there are sometimes others who are interested in the music, and firmly persuaded that their suggestions ought to be acceptable to the organist. The authority of the clergyman the organist is bound to recognise, but attempts at interference on the part of ladies and curates ought (the writer ventures to think) to be respectfully, but firmly, protested against. A good organist, when he needs help or advice, will not shrink to ask for it; but he cannot effectively perform his duty if he allows himself to be led by the whims and wishes of these would-be advisers. 'In the multitude of counsellors there is safety;' but Scott pointed out that the safety which lies in a multitude is sometimes for the counsellors and not for the counselled. If an organist, from a fear of disobliging, tries to please everyone, he will, like the man in the fable, end with satisfying nobody. Ritter, in his 'History of Music,' says: 'How often are they [able organists] not urged to perform, against their own better conviction, the very things against which their understanding and their honour as artists must revolt. It is not with the organist, generally, that the clergyman consults about the introduction of this or that contemplated change which affects

the musical part of the service. He whose musical knowledge and taste stand, in most instances, below zero, is willingly led by some fashionable musical amateur—an influential member of the Church—who considers the organist his servant, the man to whom he dictates his unchangeable will. A man of character and sound art principles will not and cannot submit to such despotic treatment, and prefers to retire from such a degrading position. Thus it happens that unprincipled ignoramuses, through base flattery and servile submission, preside in responsible places to the dishonour and demoralization of true Church art.'

These five are the principal arrangements that obtain at churches respecting the choice of the tunes: (1) the clergyman leaves the choice of them to the organist; (2) the clergyman and the organist together choose them; (3) they are chosen by the clergyman; (4) by a precentor; and (5) by a choirmaster. The first arrangement is in every way the most satisfactory, supposing the organist to be thoroughly competent, and possessed of the requisite taste and judgment—mere skill in playing would not be a sufficient qualification. But if the organist were untried and inexperienced, the second arrangement might be preferred, and the organist and clergyman would choose the tunes in consultation. The clergyman would, no doubt, be guided by the organist in purely musical questions, and, in most cases, look upon his own share of the work as a mere matter of form, though he might think it desirable to keep up the form. Indeed, it would be merely a precautionary measure on the part of the clergyman, which need not be made galling to the organist, or felt to be such by him. While allowing his organist all reasonable latitude, the clergyman would *retain the power of control*, and, like another Æolus,

'Et premere, et laxas sciret dare . . . habenas.'

He would use the power of control only when it was really necessary to do so. This arrangement has its faults, but it is infinitely preferable to those which follow, as it gives the organist a voice in the choosing of the tunes. According to the third arrangement, the clergyman chooses the tunes with-

out consulting the organist. This arrangement can only be required on very extraordinary occasions. It might be called for, if the organist had proved himself to be wanting in taste and judgment and was disposed to make himself offensive, and the authorities did not wish to dismiss him. But it need not be discussed, as few clergymen would be so unreasonable as to treat good men and intelligent artists as mere machines. The precentor or the choirmaster might be of use at churches where the organist was unfit, and the clergyman felt unable, to choose the music. But where the organist is a good general practitioner, he should be his own precentor and choirmaster.

To sum up. It ought to be left to the organist, if he is a man of proved taste and judgment, to choose his own music. Such an organist would have more pleasure in his work, and perform it more effectively, if his clergyman placed the directing of the music in his hands. But when there is a doubt, or the organist is untried and inexperienced, and the clergyman shrinks from conceding full power to him, the organist and the clergyman together might select the music. The clergyman would, in many cases, look upon his own part in this arrangement as a matter of reserved power, to be used only when he found it to be really necessary. If organists remembered the authority of their clergymen, and clergymen showed deference to the superior musical knowledge of their organists, and protected them from the interference of meddlesome persons, each would respect the other, and there could not fail to be a good understanding between them.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

SOME NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF CHURCH MUSIC—CHIEFLY FROM BURNEY.

THE chief composers of Masses and Services living in England immediately before the Reformation were John Taverner, Dr. Fayrfax, and Dr. Tye, who may be called the founders of our Church music. 'The style of these venerable musicians is grave, and the harmony, in general, unexceptionable, if tried by such rules as were established during their times; but with respect to invention, air, and accent, the first two are totally deficient.'

There is generally such a total want of design, subject, melody, and attention to the accent and meaning of the words in the pre-Reformation composers, that 'the notes seem to be thrown upon paper at random; nor could they be more devoid of meaning if the sounds of such keys as these pieces are written in had issued from a mill, or been balloted for in the Laputan manner.'

Tye lived in no fewer than four reigns—Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth's—and contributed not a little to the improvement of our Cathedral music. He and Tallis are the prominent figures in the history of the Church music of the Reformation period.

The nobility in Henry's reign seem to have loved good music. The Earl of Northumberland's chapel-establishment, in 1512, was equal to that of a cathedral. 'The gentillmen of the Chappell consisted of x Parsons—as to say—Two at x marc a pece—oone at xl*s.* and oone at xx*s.* viz. ij Basses, ij Tenors, and vi counter-tenors—childeryn of the Chappell vi after xx*vs.* the pece.' The 'orgaynes,' in general, were not played by a person appointed for that purpose, but by the choristers—'oon after an outher'; 'ande,' it is ordered, 'every man that is a player shall keep his cours weikely.' It seems to have been a part of the duty of the gentlemen and children of this establishment to perform also at the 'Playes and Interludes and dressing that is plaid in the xii Dayes of

Crestenmas,' and at the other great festivals, for which they received extra pay.

From the son of this nobleman Cardinal Wolsey, then in the plenitude of his power, demanded his choral books for the use of his own chapel. In a letter to Wolsey the young Earl says: 'I do perceayff my Lorde Cardinalls pleasour ys to have such Books as was in the Chapell of my lat Lord and ffayther (wos soll Jhu pardon). To the accomplychment of which, at your desyer, I am confformable, notwithstandinge I trust to be able ons to set up a Chapelle of myne owne—I shall with all sped send up the Boks unto my Lords Grace, as to say iiij Antiffonars, such as I think wher not seen a gret wyll—v Gralls—an Ordeorly—a Manuall —viij Prossessioners.'

Wolsey had in his chapel ten singing-priests, a master of the children, twelve singing-men (laymen), and ten singing-children, with a servant to wait on them.

Henry VIII., the last Prince of pre-Reformation times, was a good musician. He is even said to have composed two Masses, which were often sung in his chapel. When he was 'on journeys or progresses,' six singing-boys and six gentlemen of the choir made a part of the royal retinue.

In 1539 a 'Book of Ceremonies' was published, in which 'the sober, discrete, and devout singing, music, and playing with organs, used in the Church, in the service of God,' is ordained.

From a letter of Cranmer to Henry in 1545, it appears that the Venite, Te Deum, Benedictus, Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, Psalms, and Versicles, and in the Mass, the Gloria in Excelsis, Gloria Patri, Credo, Perfice, Paternoster, and portions of the Sanctus and Agnus, were sung to plain-chant.

Cranmer made an experimental setting of the English Litany to plain-chant—'not full of notes, but as near as may be, for every syllable a note.'

Edward VI. had forty-one officers of his Chapel Royal (Farrant and Tallis were of the number), at a cost of £476 15s. 5d., which sum includes the allowance to the boys, the number of whom is unknown.

In Edward's reign Tye, Tallis, and Farrant produced Services and Full Anthems in the motet style.

In 1550 the Daily Prayer and Office of the Holy Communion were set by Merbecke to a plain-chant. (Tallis afterwards harmonized it. 'The melody used by Tallis is not exactly similar to that of Marbeck; it is only of the same kind, consisting of fragments of the ancient ecclesiastical *canto fermo*.')

Burnet says it was much complained of—'that the priests read the prayers generally with the same sort of voice that they had used formerly in the Latin service, so that it was said the people did not understand it much better than they had done the Latin formerly. This I have seen represented in many letters; and it was very seriously laid before Cranmer and Martin Bucer.'

In Mary's reign and that of her illustrious sister and successor, the number and salaries of the musicians of the Royal Chapel were nearly the same as in Edward VI.'s. The officers were mostly the same in these three reigns, being generally 'turncoats,' and varying their views of religion to suit the times. But Merbecke is an exception. His Protestantism, it is said, nearly made him a martyr.

It appears strange to us (with our modern ideas of kingly authority) to learn that, in the days of the Tudors, the Sovereign sometimes impressed men and children to sing in the Royal Chapel.

Though the language used in the Church service at this period of our history was sometimes English, sometimes Latin, the music hardly varied in character.

Elizabeth's reign is an important one in the annals of Cathedral music, of which she was indeed the saviour. By her time 'a school of counterpoint had been formed in this country that was equal, at least, to that of any other part of Europe'; and during her reign, 'in spite of the fanatical spirit of the times, and the outcry of the Puritans against every species of Church music except syllabic psalmody, our Cathedral service, by the diligence and abilities of Tye, Tallis, Bird, Morley, and others, was brought to a pitch of perfection which was hardly surpassed by that of Italy itself.'

In 1560 and 1565 Day printed the Cathedral Service, with the music of Tallis and other worthies. 'The two publications by John Day fixed for near a century the style of our choral music, of which the movement is grave, the harmony grateful, and the contrivance frequently ingenious.' But the music 'obscured the sense of what was sung by too frequent fugue, as well as by an utter inattention to the accent and expression of the words.'

The chief composers of Church music (Services and Full Anthems) during Elizabeth's reign were Robert Whyte, Tallis, Bird, and Morley. Tallis and Bird wrote excellent Latin motets and hymns, and published them under the title of *Cantiones Sacræ* in 1575. (Aldrich and others afterwards adapted them for use in cathedrals.) These compositions are full of contrapuntal artifices. Morley set the Burial Service.

'Before the works and reputation of Palestrina had circulated throughout Europe, we had choral music of our own, which for gravity of style, purity of harmony, ingenuity of design, and clear and masterly con-

texture, was equal to the best productions of that truly venerable master.' But in the compositions of this period the words were very often wrongly accented.

The learned and solemn music of the sixteenth century seems more suited for use in cathedrals than compositions in the modern, free style, with their unchurchlike organ accompaniments. And it is sad that it should not be more often heard. 'The fugues and canons of the sixteenth century, like the Gothic buildings in which they were sung, have a gravity and grandeur peculiarly suited to the purpose of their construction; and when either of them shall, by time or accident, be destroyed, it is very unlikely that they will ever be replaced by others in a style equally reverential and stupendous. They should therefore be preserved as venerable relics of the musical labours and erudition of our forefathers, before the lighter strains of secular music had tinctured melody with its capricious and motley flights.'

The organists in olden time were ecclesiastics. The first lay organists of the Chapel Royal, upon record, were Tye, Tallis, and Bird, all during the reign of Elizabeth.

Elizabeth 'loved state and some magnificence in religion as well as in everything else'; she 'liked ceremonies, and hated puritanism'; she was a good musician; and she saved Church music. The service in her own chapel was performed with organs and other instruments.

The Injunctions of 1559 required collegiate and parish churches, that had choral establishments, to retain them, and to use a 'modest and distinct song' in all parts of the common prayers, 'that the same might be as plainly understood as if it were read without singing.'

'These Injunctions are supposed to have been compiled by the select divines who had been employed in Sir Thos. Smith's house about the Prayer-book; but the hand of the Secretary Cecil was upon them; to amend them after the Queen's mind. So that, as had been the case with the Prayer-book itself, the influence of the Court was exercised against the opinion of the leading Protestant divines.' That the Queen was thought to have exceeded her prerogative on this occasion appears from a letter of Archbishop Parker to Lord Burghley: 'Whatsoever the [Queen's] ecclesiastical prerogative is, I fear it is not so great as your pen hath given it in the Injunctions' (Procter, 'History of the Book of Common Prayer,' p. 61 and *note*).

Heylin, speaking of the results of the Injunctions, says: 'As plainsong was retained in most parish churches for the daily psalms, so in her own chapels, and in the quire of all cathedrals, and some colleges, the hymns were sung after a more melodious manner, with organs commonly, and sometimes with other musical instruments, as the solemnity required. . . . In 1560 the Church of England, as it was first settled and established

under Queen Elizabeth, may be regarded as brought to perfection. . . . Musick was retained in all such churches in which provision had been made for the maintenance of it, or where the people could be trained up at least to plain song.'

But Heylin wrote a hundred years after the time he is speaking of. And it is impossible, after reading the homily 'Of the Place and Time of Prayer,' which was written by a bishop who lived during Elizabeth's reign, to believe that chanting could have been as common in parish churches as the excellent and enthusiastic Heylin would lead us to suppose. In this homily a woman is imagined as lamenting the changes made in the manner of performing Divine service, and saying to her neighbour: 'Alas, gossip, what shall we now do at church, since all the saints are taken away, since all the goodly sights we were wont to have are gone, since we cannot hear the like piping, singing, chanting, and playing upon the organs, that we could before?'

But whatever may have been the precise quantity of music used at parish churches in Elizabeth's reign—that the cathedral service was used only at cathedrals and collegiate churches in the reign of Charles II. is shown by the titles of two books published in 1664: 'Short Directions for the Performance of Cathedral Service. . . . Published for the information of such as are ignorant in the performance of that service, and shall be called to officiate in cathedral or collegiate churches.' 'Collection of Divine services and anthems usually sung in his Majestie's chapell, and in all the cathedral and collegiate choirs, of England and Ireland.' The same negative kind of proof, that the choral service was not used at parish churches in the reign of James II., is furnished by the fact that the commission of great divines who met in 1689 to prepare alterations in the liturgy, agreed that 'the chanting of Divine service in cathedral churches should be laid aside, that the whole may be rendered intelligible to the common people.' From which it may safely be inferred that the cathedral service was not used at parish churches: since, if the commissioners objected to the use of a musical service at cathedrals, they would not have failed to discourage its continuance at parish churches, had it existed there.*

[While the artistic, or choral service was used at churches with choral establishments (cathedrals, chapels royal, and collegiate churches), the service at parish churches was plain enough. At many parish churches there was no music, but metrical psalms, chosen by the clerk (who, according to the 91st Canon, of 1604, was to be known to be 'sufficient for his reading, writing, and also for his competent skill in singing, if it may be'). One of the duties of this officer was to choose and lead the psalmody. Sometimes he read each line aloud before the people sang it, for the benefit of such as could not read. In course of time choristers

* See also pp. 194, 195, 196, and the second extract in the note, p. 204.

and instruments (flutes, hautboys, clarionets, bassoons, and the like)—now laid aside for a harmonium or an organ—appeared in churches. The more important churches had organs (and sometimes wind instruments, and even stringed instruments also), Smith and Harris erecting organs in many London, and some country, churches in the latter half of the seventeenth century. (Byfield, Schrider, Schwarbrook, the Jordans, and Bridge carried on the work in the first half of the eighteenth century. Snetzler, the younger Byfield, Green, Avery, and the Englands are later; Avery and the younger England continuing to build organs even in the early part of the present century.) The organs made by all these excellent builders, it is scarcely needful to say, were finger-organs. But in country places the instruments were generally of the 'barrel' kind.* When there was a choir, the Canticles were sometimes chanted, and sometimes the Psalms—to the great disgust of people who had inherited puritanical ideas. These objectors would sometimes openly show their rooted abhorrence of chanting the Psalms by sitting down with their hats on.†]

The reign of James I. is interesting to the musical historian chiefly from the fact that Orlando Gibbons then lived and wrote. As this truly great musician died in 1625, the Service in F, and the anthems 'Hosanna,' 'Oh clap your Hands,' and 'Almighty and Everlasting,' show what a composer of genius and learning could produce early in the seventeenth century.

Charles I. was very fond of hearing anthems and services, and often chose them himself. Child was the principal composer of his reign.

In 1645 the Directory was substituted for the Prayer-book, and its use enforced. The cathedral service was totally suppressed. 'This gave a grievous wound to sacred music, not only checking its cultivation, but annihilating as much as possible the means of restoring it, by destroying all the church books, as entirely as those of the Romish communion had been at the time of the Reformation. Nothing now but syllabic and unisonous psalmody was authorized in the church; organs were taken down, organists and choirmen turned adrift, and the art of music, and indeed all the arts but those of killing, canting, and hypocrisy, were discouraged.'

If we may trust Thomas Mace, the psalmody in country churches was not very well rendered in the reign of Charles II. ''Tis sad,' he says in

* It would be interesting to know if barrel-organs are still used anywhere. The writer was present at a service in a little country church in Derbyshire some fifteen years ago where there was a powerful one, which, however, played only the psalm tunes. Perhaps chants were not included in its repertory, or the operator may not have been skilful enough to undertake to accompany the chanting.

† To this day some people call the Prayer-book psalms the 'reading psalms,' and the metrical psalms the 'singing psalms,' or the 'Psalms of David.'

his 'Musick's Monument,' written in 1676, 'to hear what whining, toling, yelling, or screeking there is in our country congregations, where, if there be no organ to compel them to harmonical unity, the people seem affrighted or distracted.' Mace advises congregations to purchase organs. His suggestions for creating a supply of organists are curious to read now, when organists are only too plentiful. He recommends that 'the clark learn to pulse or strike the psalm-tunes' (which he offers himself to teach for thirty or forty shillings); 'and the clark afterwards may instruct all the boys in the parish for a shilling or two a piece to perform the business as well as himself. And thus by little and little the parish will swarm or abound with organists.'

At the Restoration the cathedral service was restored, only after considerable trouble, and the reign of Charles II. was 'more favourable to the progress of our native church [cathedral] music than any other except that of Queen Elizabeth.'

Charles grew tired of the grave and solemn music of Tallis, Bird, and the old masters, and desired the composers of the royal chapel to introduce symphonies for instruments (violins, cornets, and sackbuts) into their anthems. Pelham Humphrey, Blow, and Wise, choristers of the royal chapel, were encouraged by the King to produce both full and verse anthems. Composers began now to have some idea of expression. Humphrey is said to have been sent to Paris to study under Lully. Both he and his fellow-composers of the royal chapel indulged the King's French taste in their anthems. When Charles died, Purcell was twenty-seven years old, and had been nine years organist of Westminster Abbey, and three years organist of the Chapel Royal.

This great genius, who was equally happy in the learned style of Tallis and Gibbons, and a more expressive style of his own, flourished during the reigns of Charles II., James II., and William and Mary. His anthems and services, if not more learned than those of his predecessors, are infinitely more varied and expressive. 'His music is often "rich and strange," but never vulgar. It has the unfortunate property of making all other music (excepting pure old Church music and Bach's organ fugues) appear common and insipid' (Crotch's 'Lectures on Music'). His melody is often wanting in symmetry and grace, and he is not free from mannerisms. But his genius, 'though less cultivated and polished, was equal to that of the greatest masters on the Continent.' Some of his anthems have symphonies for stringed instruments. In his grand *Te Deum and Jubilate*, written in 1694 for St. Cecilia's Day, he uses such instruments as were known in his time. This composition was produced nearly twenty years before Handel's Utrecht *Te Deum*, and nearly fifty years before the famous Dettingen *Te Deum*. As the admirable Gibbons was the composer at the beginning, so Purcell stands conspicuous at the end of the seventeenth century, and connects those learned and solemn

old writers, his predecessors, with the great composers of the eighteenth century. Purcell, who seems to have been as feeble in constitution as he was vigorous in mind, died in 1695, aged but thirty-seven. It is impossible to say what splendid work he might not have produced had his life been prolonged into the eighteenth century, and he been acquainted with the works of his contemporaries.

Dr. Crotch says of Purcell, 'We ought not to be unacquainted with any work of this man, who was not only the greatest master of his time, but the most extraordinary genius that this nation ever produced.' Though Purcell is the pride and delight of English musicians, the popular craving for *something new* (which requires to be satisfied with a new kind of Church music, and anthems full of modern improvements (?) and novel 'effects'), combined, perhaps, with want of taste on the part of some of those whose duty it is to choose the music in high places, is causing the music of the old master to be gradually laid aside.

After Purcell come a succession of composers of excellent Church music, including such well-known names as Jeremiah Clarke, Aldrich, Croft, Greene, Boyce, Nares, Battishill, Arnold, Attwood, and the late Dr. Wesley.

The English cathedral service, though it ever maintained its ground, except during the troublous times of the Commonwealth, has always been an object of mistrust to many well-meaning people. It is remarkable that, though often nearly overthrown, it was always saved by the Sovereign.

Even so early as the reign of Henry VIII. some of the more zealous reformers declared that 'Synging, and saying of mass, matins, or evensong, is but roryng, howling, whistelyng, mummying, conjuryng, and jogelyng, and the playing at the organys a foolish vanitie.'*

In Queen Elizabeth's time the Puritans censured and opposed 'all curious singing and playing at the organs.' ('Curious singing' was a species of polyphonic music, full of intricacy and complicated measures, which caused the words to become confused and unintelligible.) Among the proposals prepared by them in 1562, there is one 'that the Psalms may be sung distinctly by the whole congregation, and that organs may be laid aside.'

Burnet says: 'The offence which was taken at organs and Church music, as practised in cathedrals, was rather general; and the question of rejecting them was agitated in the Convocation of 1562.'

The outcry and violence of the Puritans against 'playing upon organs, curious singing, and tossing about the Psalms from side to side,' were very great in Elizabeth's reign.

* So thought the clergy of the Lower House within the Province of Canterbury in 1536.

(The great Hooker defends the use of suitable Church music in his 'Ecclesiastical Polity.')

In 1571, in their Confession, the Puritans say, 'Concerning singing of Psalms, we allow of the people's joining with one voice in a plain tune, but not of tossing the Psalms from one side to the other, with intermingling of organs.'

They wished to break up choral establishments, and to take the money of the singers and pay preachers with it.

In 1586 they published 'A Request of all true Christians to the House of Parliament,' in which they pray, 'That all cathedral churches may be put down, where the service of God is grievously abused by piping with organs, singing, ringing, and trowling of Psalms from one side of the choir to another, with the squeaking of chanting choristers disguised (as are all the rest) in white surplices ; some in corner caps and silly copes, imitating the fashion and manner of Antichrist the Pope, that man of sin, and child of perdition, with his other rabble of miscreants and shavelings.'*

(The Puritans' love of metrical psalmody and dislike of organs, choristers, and the cathedral service finds expression in the words of the enthusiastic Major Bridgenorth, in 'Peveril of the Peak.' Speaking of a service, at which he was present, in a remote American settlement, he says: 'Our temple was but constructed of wooden logs ; but when shall the chant of trained hirelings, or the sounding of tin and brass tubes amid the aisles of a minster, arise so sweetly to Heaven, as did the psalm in which we united at once our voices and our hearts !')

At the Great Rebellion, 'in the opinion of those that were then in power, it was thought necessary for the promotion of true religion that no organs should be suffered to remain in the churches ; that choral-books should be torn and destroyed ; painted glass windows broken ; the cathedral service totally abolished ; and that those retainers to the Church, whose function had been to assist in such profane vanities, should betake themselves to some employment less offensive to the Lord. In consequence of these tenets, collegiate and parochial churches had been stripped of their organs and ornaments ; monuments defaced ; sepulchral inscriptions engraven on brass torn up ; libraries and repositories ransacked for musical service-books of every kind, which being all deemed alike superstitious and ungodly, were committed to the flames, or otherwise destroyed, and the utmost efforts used at total extirpation. And, indeed, their endeavours had been so effectual, that when the heads of the Church set about re-establishing the cathedral service, it was equally difficult to

* In his 'Histrio-Mastyx,' published in 1633, the Puritan Prynne speaks in no measured terms against Church music. 'The music in the churches he affirmed not to be the noise of men, but a bleating of brute beasts ; choristers bellow the tenor, as it were oxen ; bark a counterpart, as it were a kennel of dogs ; roar out a treble, as it were a sort of bulls ; and grunt out a base, as it were a number of hogs.'—RUSHWORTH, quoted by HUME.

find instruments, performers, books, and singers able to do the requisite duty.'

Dr. Rimbault (Rimbault and Hopkins, on 'The Organ,' pp. 91-98) gives a highly interesting account of the destruction of organs, and the desperate proceedings of the fanatical Parliamentary soldiers during the Interregnum.

(It is not to be supposed that if they detested the cathedral service, the Puritans disliked music. If Cromwell permitted, and perhaps encouraged his regiment to savagely demolish the organs in Peterborough Cathedral, he is said, on the authority of old Anthony Wood, to have 'loved a good voice and instrumental music well.' Milton, who inherited musical talents from his father, is said to have solaced himself in his affliction with playing on the organ.)

The difference between the Puritan theory of Church service and that of the Church of England is shown by the following:

(1) Church of England.

The 18th Canon, of 1604, says: 'None, either man, woman, or child, of what calling soever, shall be otherwise at such times busied in the Church, than in quiet attendance to hear, mark, and understand that which is read, preached, or ministered; saying in their due places audibly with the minister, the Confession, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed; and making such other answers to the public prayers as are appointed in the Book of Common Prayer.'

(2) Puritan.

At the Savoy Conference, 1661, the Puritans proposed 'to omit the repetitions and responses of the clerk and people, and the alternate reading of the Psalms and hymns [the Prayer-book Psalms and Canticles], which cause a confused murmur in the congregation: the minister being appointed for the people in all Public Services appertaining to God; and the Holy Scriptures intimating the people's part in public prayer to be only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto, and to declare their consent in the close by saying *Amen*.'

The first of these quotations opposes the theory of a silent congregation, and requires the people to take part in the public services of the Church; the second advocates silent worship on the part of the congregation, and opposes response-saying and the reading of the Psalms by the minister and people. Both show that in the services of the Church of England the people took part audibly, and that the services were not rendered chorally in churches.

In the 'Heart of Midlothian' Scott makes his heroine write a letter from England to her father, in which she tells that staunch Presbyterian that 'there are a sort of chosen people in the land, for they hae some

kirks without organs that are like ours, and are called Meeting-houses, where the minister preaches without a gown.' What would Jeanie Deans and Douce Davie have said, could they have foreseen that one day organs would multiply in the churches of Scotland !*

And what would the worthy old English Puritans have said, if one had told them that a generation of Nonconformists would one day spring up in England, who would not only have organs in their places of worship, but sometimes even chanting and anthems !

APPENDIX B.

NOTES ON METRICAL PSALMODY—PARTLY FROM BURNEY.

'THE use of Metrical Hymns began in the churches of the East, and was brought into the West by Ambrose, Bishop of Milan (374), who composed hymns in Latin to the glory of the Holy Trinity for the people to sing in church to preserve them from the Arian heresy' (Procter, 'History of the Book of Common Prayer,' p. 173). Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, another vigorous opposer of Arianism (350), also composed hymns to be sung in the Western churches. By some the authorship of the *Te Deum* is attributed to him.

'Metrical Psalmody,' Burney remarks, 'was always in favour with reformers and schismatics.' The Arians, in the fourth century, marched in procession through the streets of Constantinople, singing hymns. Those early Protestants, the Albigenses and Waldenses, were psalm-singers. They went to the stake singing psalms. The sect created by Wickliffe's Poor Priests in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries sang psalms, and are supposed to have taken their name of 'Lollards' from the old German *lullen*, 'to sing in a low tone.' The Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, led by Jerome of Prague and John Huss, used hymns and religious songs in their churches in the fifteenth century. Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Beza, Buchanan, and John Knox, in the sixteenth century, all took an interest in psalmody.

If the archaic Gregorian chant was the Church music of the priests centuries ago, and to this day continues to be used in the services of the Church of Rome, in Protestant countries Metrical Psalmody was, and so long as the Reformed Church exists will continue to be, the Church

* Smollett seems to have foreseen that the Scottish objection to Church organs would die out. In his last work (written in 1771) he makes the principal character say: 'Some of the [Edinburgh] churches have admitted such ornaments as would have excited sedition, even in England, a little more than a century ago; and psalmody is here practised and taught by a professor from the cathedral of Durham. I should not be surprised, in a few years, to hear it accompanied with an organ.'

music of the people. There can be little doubt that the new order of Church music recommended itself highly to the people, and helped greatly in the spread of the Reformation. Wherever it was started, it drew large congregations. The voice of the people, hitherto silenced, was now heard, everyone singing in his own language the praises of God.

Roger Askam, in a letter from Augsburg, dated May 14, 1551, says: 'Three or four thousand singing at a time in a church of this city is but a trifle.' And according to Beza, in 1558 some of the Huguenots, being in the Prez aux Clercs, a public place at Paris, near the University, began to sing psalms, in which others who were there at the time joined. This was continued for several days by great numbers, among whom was the King of Navarre, and many Huguenot nobles. Bishop Jewel, writing to Peter Martyr in 1560, says: 'Immediately, not only the churches in the neighbourhood, but in the towns far distant, began to vie with each other in the same practice. You may now sometimes see at St. Paul's Cross, after the service, 6,000 people, old and young, of both sexes, all singing together and praising God.'

The inspiriting effect of good unisonous singing is well known to those who have heard it, as it is still rendered in the Lutheran churches of Germany. In 1644 (the reign of Charles I.) Thomas Mace was delighted with the psalm-singing in the cathedral at York, which 'was the very best harmonical music he ever heard; yea, far excelling all other either private or publick cathedral music, and infinitely beyond all verbal expression or conceiving.' 'They had then a custom in that church,' he says, 'that always before the sermon the whole congregation sang a psalm, together with the quire and the organ; and you must also know, that there was then a most excellent—large—plump—lusty—full—speaking organ, which cost, as I am credibly informed, a thousand pounds. This organ, I say (when the Psalm was set before the sermon), being let out into all its fulness of stops, together with the quire, began the Psalm. But when that vast conchording unity of the whole congregational chorus came (as I may say) thundering in, even so, as it made the very ground shake under us; (oh the unutterable ravishing soul's delight!) in the which I was so transported, and wrapt up into high contemplation, that there was no room left in my whole man, viz., body and spirit, for anything below divine and heavenly raptures.' Beza says: 'When I came into the assembly where they were singing the praises of God, I found myself suddenly inspired with a divine warmth, and strangely affected with love and joy, so that the assembly appeared to me as the gate of heaven, or an entrance into glory.'

In the time of the Great Rebellion the singing of metrical psalms, though perhaps not quite so common as in the days of Jerome, when 'you could not go into the fields, but you might hear the ploughman at his hallelujahs, the mower at his hymns, and the vine-dresser singing

David's Psalms,' was in great favour with the Puritans, whom their political adversaries nicknamed 'Psalm-singers.' Cromwell's troopers sang them, and charged to victory. (It may even be said that metrical psalmody contributed to place that able but unscrupulous man at the head of the State.) In his 'Peveril of the Peak' Scott makes allusion to psalm-singing and its effects. The Puritans, as they proceed to the memorable banquet, raise a triumphal psalm when they reach the gate 'which the Lord opened to the godly.' The Cavaliers attempt to laugh them to scorn, but unsuccessfully. The psalm-tune, which now came rolling on their ear, had been heard too often, and upon too many occasions had preceded victory gained over the 'malignants,' to permit them, even in their triumph, to hear it without emotion.

But psalmody could be used for other than religious or warlike purposes. When the lady of the house goes to receive her Puritan guests, they return her courtesy by raising the 133rd Psalm :

'O what a happy thing it is,
And joyful, for to see
Brethren to dwell together in
Friendship and unity!'

In Scotland, also, as indeed in every land whither the Reformation spread, the effect of psalmody, in binding together the members of sects, and rousing and inspiriting them, is seen. Search was made for insurgents who, on a particular occasion, had insulted the bishops and the Queen Regent in her own palace, and destroyed the statue of St. Giles ; but none could be apprehended, 'for the brethren assembled themselves in such sort, in companies, singing Psalms, and praising God, that the proudest of their enemies were astonished.'

The stern Covenanters were enthusiastic psalm-singers, and in 'Old Mortality' they are, of course, represented as such. At Loudon Hill they reply to the bold and warlike flourish of menace and defiance of the trumpets and drums of the royal cavalry, by uniting their voices, and sending forth, in solemn modulation, the two first verses of the 76th Psalm, according to the metrical version of the Scottish Kirk. A short, or rather a solemn, acclamation attends the close of the stanza ; and after a dead pause, the second verse is resumed by the insurgents, who apply the destruction of the Assyrians as prophetical of the issue of their own impending contest.

But besides being used in Divine service and on public occasions (religious and political), the Psalms were sung in private devotion ; and doubtless they were a delight and solace to many. From Burns' 'Cotter's Saturday Night,' we learn that psalm-singing was one of the pious occupations of the cotter's family a hundred years ago (see the thirteenth stanza of that fine poem). In England also psalm-singing was a favourite indoor occupation for families. Hawkins, in his 'History of Music,'

says: 'The time is hardly beyond the reach of some persons living [1776] when psalmody was considered a delightful exercise. . . . A passenger on a Sunday evening, from St. Paul's to Aldgate, would have heard the families in most houses in his way occupied in singing psalms.'

If the Puritans greatly disliked chanting, their love of metrical versions was boundless. They would even have substituted metrical versions of such parts of the service as the Canticles and the Lord's Prayer for the prose forms.

(This love of metrical versions was not peculiar to the Puritans. Luther had not only made metrical translations of many of the ancient Latin hymns, but had also done the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and other parts of his liturgy into German verse. He had even written his catechism in verse, and had it set to music in harmony. The 'Confession of Augsburg' had been done into verse and set to music. The Picards and Bohemian Brethren, in their book of 1538, had bound up metrical versions of the Te Deum, Benedictus, Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, Veni Creator, the Humble Suit of a Sinner, the Athanasian Creed, and the Lord's Prayer with metrical hymns. Our own Prayer-books contained till quite recently, not only Tate and Brady's Version of the Psalms, hymns for Christmas, Easter, and the Holy Communion, and the Morning and Evening Hymns, but also metrical versions of the Veni Creator, Te Deum, Benedictus, Magnificat, and Nunc Dimittis, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Lamentation of a Sinner.)

When the Puritans stopped the cathedral service, and Church music was limited to the singing of metrical psalmody, their divines issued the following excellent instructions: 'It is the duty of Christians to praise God publickly by singing of psalms together, in the congregation, and also privately in the family. In singing of psalms the voices to be audibly and gravely ordered; but the chief care must be to sing with understanding and with grace in the heart, making melody unto the Lord. That the whole congregation may join herein, everyone that can read is to have a Psalm-book, and all others, not disabled by age or otherwise, are to be exhorted to learn to read. But for the present, when many in the congregation cannot read, it is convenient that the minister, or some fit person appointed by him and the other ruling officers, do read the Psalm, line by line, before the singing thereof.'

(Happily all are now compelled to learn to read, and it is no longer necessary to have recourse to the expedient recommended in the last sentence of the above.)

In England metrical psalmody was not used by the Puritans only; it was the staple of our parish church music, and continued to be till within the memory of many people now living. It thrust out the old method of rendering the Psalms, as metrical hymnody is now thrusting out the

sentences from Scripture which the Prayer-book appoints to be read during the offertory.

Germany is the home of metrical psalmody. Before the rise of Lutheranism, the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren had used metrical versions in their assemblies. In 1504 Bishop Lucas made a hymn-book —'the first hymn-book containing melodies set to native words'—for the use of these sects. (It is worth noticing that in comparatively recent times members of the Moravian communion have written excellent hymns.) In 1538 a book with musical notes was printed at Ulm for the Picards and Bohemian Brethren. This collection contains metrical translations of many Roman Catholic hymns. 'The melodies are borrowed from the old Roman chants.'

The Lutheran Psalmody.

Luther seems to have been rather a versifier and a compiler of tunes than an original poet and composer. Of the many tunes that have been attributed to him, only the famous 'Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott,' and two others, are certainly known to be his. The tune known as 'Luther's Hymn' is not thought to be his composition, though it appears in Kluge's collection of 1531. He paraphrased the Psalms, and made metrical versions of some of the finest Latin hymns. (It is remarkable that only one Latin hymn—the 'Come, Holy Ghost, eternal God'—is retained in our Prayer-book.) For his tunes he chose popular melodies (sacred and secular). The tunes of some of those *choräle*, which are the delight of congregations and connoisseurs, were originally love-songs. It is not, however, to be supposed that these old German melodies were light and frivolous. 'A certain air of religious expression prevails throughout the *Lied* productions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and reformers found little to change in these secular compositions when they thought fit to make use of them in Divine worship. The form of the melody, the harmonic treatment, the compactness of the whole form—all developed from the folk-song, secular as well as sacred—were qualities with which the people could readily sympathize, because they understood them, and the more so as the words wedded to these songs were in the German language' (Ritter, 'History of Music').

Johann Walther and Conrad Rumpf had the honour of helping Luther with his tunes; and Johann Galliculus and Ludwig Senfl composed many for him.

Walther published a hymn-book at Wittenberg, in 1524, under Luther's supervision. The melody, or part for the congregation, was in the tenor. The harmony was in four, five, and sometimes six parts; and the counterpoint was not of the 'note against note' species, but often florid.

(Whatever faults Luther's detractors may seek to lay to his charge, the memory of this wonderful man must ever be dear to us.)

After Luther's day, the good work of arranging and harmonizing melodies, or composing original tunes, for the Lutheran Church, was continued by able men like John Eccard, Leo Hassler, Michael Pretorius, Melchior Vulpius, Schoppe, Rosenmüller, Neumark, and John Krüger.

(The use of organ interludes in accompanying the psalmody was known in the Lutheran churches at least as early as 1580. Montaigne, who travelled in Germany in that year, mentions it in his journal.)

THE PSALMODY OF THE GENEVAN CALVINISTS AND THE HUGUENOTS.

In 1540 Clement Marot versified about thirty of the Psalms, and published them at Paris. (He afterwards did twenty more at Geneva. The fifty were printed, without music, at Geneva in 1543. Beza did the rest of the Psalms, and the whole 150 were published at Strasburg in 1545.)

In 1545 Clement Marot and Beza's Psalms were published at Geneva, with melodies adapted by Guillaume Franc. (Bourgeois, Goudimel, Claude le Jeune, and others, afterwards harmonized the melodies in plain or florid counterpoint.)

The Calvinists of Switzerland and the Huguenots of France, unlike Luther, did not borrow from the Roman Catholic Church. They 'adapted the Psalms versified by Clement Marot and Theodore Beza for their musical service. The melodies, as far as can be ascertained, were adapted from popular people's-songs [sacred and secular], and harmonized in a simple form by Claude Goudimel and Claude le Jeune' (Ritter, 'History of Music'). In the earliest editions the tunes are not harmonized. 'The Calvinists of Geneva admitted no harmony, and therefore Goudimel's and Le Jeune's settings were not used at Geneva, but by the French Huguenots and Calvinists out of Geneva' (Burney).

In 1551 thirty-four psalms were added to the Geneva Psalter, and the 'Old Hundredth' appears for the first time.

In 1561 a setting of eighty-three psalms to music in four, five, and six parts by Louis Bourgeois was published at Paris and Lyons.

In 1562 the Geneva Psalter was completed; the tunes are not harmonized.

In 1565 Goudimel harmonized the whole Psalter of Marot in four parts, and published it at Paris.

(Many of Goudimel's settings are too florid and too like motets to be suitable for congregational use; they were reprinted in Holland in 1607.)

In 1627 Claude le Jeune harmonized the Psalms in plain counterpoint in four and five parts.

(Before they were set to music, Marot and Beza's Psalms were sung by Calvinists, Lutherans, and Catholics, in private to secular tunes, which, however, were not lively. But when, in 1553, they were bound

up with Calvin's Catechism and the Geneva Liturgy, the Catholics forbade the further use of them.)

The Lutherans and Calvinists borrowed tunes from one another, and we in England borrowed from both. Thus the finest old tunes in the English Psalters (the 'Old Hundredth,' *e.g.*) are either Lutheran or Calvinistic.

The English Psalmody.

Sir Thomas Wyatt is said to have translated some of the Psalms into English metre during the reign of Henry VIII.; and Coverdale versified a number of 'Ghostly Psalms and Spiritual Songs,' which were burnt by an order of Henry in 1546.

About 1547 Sternhold versified nineteen psalms, and dedicated the work to Edward VI.; and in 1549 he and Hopkins published forty-four psalms.

In 1562 Sternhold and Hopkins' complete edition of the Psalms—the 'Old Version'—was published, with about forty tunes.

(The Protestants who had fled the country in Mary's reign versified psalms. Some of William Whittingham's and William Kethe's rendering appear in the Old Version.)

In 1562 John Daye printed his Psalter, which contains all the Psalms and sixty-three tunes (melodies only). The tunes are chiefly German.

In 1579 Daman's Psalter appeared. 'William Daman first composed parts to the melodies in England.' The tunes were 'for the use of godly Christians, for recreating themselves, instede of fond, unseemely ballades.' This collection contains about forty tunes, and is rather a tune-book than a psalter.

In 1585 Cosyns published sixty psalms in six parts and in plain counterpoint to the melodies in common use.

In 1591 another edition of Daman appeared.

In 1592 Este's 'Psalter' was published—'The whole Book of Psalms, with their wonted tunes in four parts.' The harmony, which is 'note against note,' and very correct, is the work of Kirkbye, Farnaby, John Dowland, and six others. This Psalter has a tune for each psalm.

In 1599 Allison published a Psalter. The tunes may be either sung, or played on instruments ('lutes, orpharions, citternes, and bass viols').

In 1621 Ravenscroft published his first edition, which has a melody for each psalm. Many of the melodies are his own; others are 'still sung by the German, Netherlandish, or French Protestants' (Burney). The harmony is four-part. Tallis and twenty others added the three parts. There are only five tunes in triple time. (Another edition of this work appeared in 1633.)

In 1643 Rous's Psalter appeared.

In 1671 John Playford's Psalter was published. It has bar-lines, and the harmony is four-part. This Psalter had a very large sale, and

rendered 'psalm-singing in parts a favourite amusement in almost every village in the kingdom.'

Tate and Brady (the 'New Version') published 1696.*

The Scottish Psalmody.

Psalm-singing was very early practised in Scotland. The Wedderburn (or Dundee) Collection is first mentioned in 1546, but the date of the publication of the work is not known.

In 1556 John Knox instituted the Protestant worship in Scotland; and in 1560 his Confession of Faith was adopted by the Scottish Parliament.

In 1565 John Knox's Psalms and Liturgy were published at Edinburgh. The collection contained 138 tunes.

In 1615 Andrew Hart's Psalter was published at Edinburgh.

In 1633 Raban's Psalter was published at Aberdeen.

In 1635 an authorized edition (with harmony) was published at Edinburgh by the heirs of Andrew Hart.

Remarks on the Old Psalters.

In the literature of the old psalmody the terms 'proper' and 'common' are applied to tunes. A 'proper' tune was one that was 'proper' to a particular psalm, and always sung to it. A 'common' tune was one that was made to serve for several psalms. The 'proper' tunes were called after the psalms to which they belonged: as, 'The Hundredth,' 'The Hundred and Twenty-fourth' tunes. The 'common' tunes, which were of later date than the 'proper,' were named after places. Common tunes

* The two following notices will probably be interesting to those who have not already seen them:

'At the Court at Kensington, December 3, 1696. Present the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.—Upon the humble Petition of Nicholas Brady and Nahum Tate, this Day read at the Board, setting forth, that the Petitioners have, with their utmost Care and Industry, completed A New Version of the Psalms of David, in English Metre, fitted for public Use; and humbly praying his Majesty's Royal Allowance, that the said Version may be used in such Congregations as shall think fit to receive it:

'His Majesty taking the same into his Royal Consideration, is pleased to order in Council, That the said New Version of the Psalms, in English Metre, be, and the same is hereby Allowed and Permitted to be used in all such Churches, Chapels, and Congregations, as shall think fit to receive the same.

'W. Bridgeman.'

'*May* 23*rd*, 1698.

'His Majesty having Allowed and Permitted the Use of a New Version of the Psalms of David, by Dr. Brady and Mr. Tate, in all Churches, Chapels and Congregations; I cannot do less than wish a good Success to this Royal Indulgence; For I find it a Work done with so much Judgment and Ingenuity, that I am persuaded it may take off that unhappy Objection, which has hitherto lain against the Singing Psalms; [Sternhold and Hopkins' 'Old Version'] and dispose that part of Divine Service to much more Devotion. And I do heartily recommend the Use of this Version to all my Brethren within my Diocese.

'H. London.'

begin to appear in Este's Psalter (1592); ten are found in Allison (1599). They appear in the Scottish Psalters of Andrew Hart (1615) and Raban.

The old tunes were such that all could take part in them; and as they were comparatively few in number, the people would soon know them by heart.

Burney, writing a hundred years ago, says the parochial tunes had become 'so generally and firmly established that it would be difficult to prevail on the whole nation to agree in admitting any new melodies of this kind by whomsoever composed.'

In the old tunes the principal melody, or *canto fermo*, for the congregation is always in the tenor. It did not become general to transfer it to the soprano much before the end of the eighteenth century.

Psalm and hymn tunes may be classified as follows:

1*st Period.*—The (obsolete) motet-like tune—unsettled as to tonality and form.

2*nd Period.*—The grand old tune—majestic and impressive—tonality not always modern.

3*rd Period.*—The melodious tune—more or less elegant and pleasing; and the florid tune—cheerful, but often too lively.

4*th Period.*—The tune at present popular—often weak and 'sugary'—seldom inspiriting, but timidly quiet, and seeming fitter to soothe the dying than to rouse the living.

APPENDIX C.

NOTE ON THE MUSICAL ARRANGEMENTS AT FRENCH ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCHES.*

THERE is no *law* as to placing the organ and choir. But the singers should always (by custom) occupy the choir of the church; though this is possible only at large churches and cathedrals. In small churches there would not be room enough for the singers and the *enfants de chœur*.

Every choir should be composed only of clergymen or persons who intend to take Orders;† but because these are not always sufficiently numerous, they take laymen, and even boys; and these, in large and wealthy churches, wear the surplice. In small and poor churches the choir, if there is one, is composed of laymen and boys only. At great performances on great festivals, when difficult solos are to be sung by

* For the following note the Author is indebted to a foreign Roman Catholic gentleman, a professor at a French Jesuit College, who obligingly got him the information from the Fathers.

† Perhaps novices are meant.—AUTHOR.

prime donne, these ladies are seldom permitted to sing in the chancel,* but the choir goes to the *Tribune*† with all the staff (clergy, men, boys, and all).

In churches where the singers are forced to go to the *Tribune*—that is, at perhaps four churches out of five—the choirs are composed *very* often of men and women, and sometimes a few boys.

When the choir or chancel is large enough to contain the singers, there is generally a smaller organ (not a weak one, however) to accompany them. (The priest is never accompanied; but the organ may give him the note, if he cannot keep the pitch.) This organ is played by a second organist, or by the choirmaster; and the large organ in the *Tribune* is not used in accompaniment: it plays only voluntaries.

Les enfants de chœur are sometimes numerous: but in Low Masses there are generally only two of them. Even one is sufficient. He assists the priest, and says parts of the prayers, for the congregation, in reply to the priest. The *enfants de chœur* never sing.

APPENDIX D.

EXAMINATIONS IN LITERARY WORK—ARTS TESTS.

It is not seldom that one hears it said of musicians that they are uneducated men. Indeed, some people seem to think that organists must almost necessarily be men of no education, and no position. An organist called at a clergyman's house to ask for particulars respecting a vacant organistship, and, learning during the interview that the clergyman made it a matter of principle to choose the tunes himself, said he thought the choosing of the tunes ought to be left to the organist, if he were a competent man. The clergyman's wife here joined the controversy, and the respect in which she held the profession may be inferred from her remark: 'I have a good cook, but I should not like her to choose the dishes' (!). The ridiculous expression, 'He is only an organist,' is common enough among unmusical people, who seem almost disposed to class modern Church musicians with the merry minstrels and *jongleurs* of a bygone period.

While not agreeing with what is said by careless speakers, the sincere friends and well-wishers of Church musicians must probably feel themselves compelled to admit that organists are not always as well educated as they might be. No serious person would require that Church musicians should be great classical scholars, or expect every organist to be a

* When they sit in the chancel, they are probably screened-off from observation.—Author.

† The west gallery.—Author.

Herschel ;* but everyone interested in Church music would be glad to see the old reproach of ignorance removed from organists, and the professional status generally raised.

The Universities, formerly contented to admit, as candidates for musical degrees, men who could produce letters from Masters of Arts certifying that they were 'qualified in manners and learning to be members of the University,' now require that such candidates shall pass a stiff examination in literary work. Probably the authorities may smile when they hear the examination called a 'stiff' one ; but although Responsions, the Previous Examination, the Senior 'Local' Examination, the Examination of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board, the Dublin Examination, and Matriculation at London, must appear quite elementary tests of scholarship in their eyes, musicians find them very hard. Even undergraduates, who are professedly reading for a B.A. degree, find 'Smalls' and the 'Little-go' sufficiently difficult, and the other examinations are little easier.† Indeed, the examinations in literary work are so stiff that unless a musician pass them in his youth, when the education he received at school—and it must be no mean one—is still fresh in his memory, there is but very little chance that he will ever pass them at all. An organist's time is fully occupied ; his duties are many and onerous ; he must devote some time every day to practising the organ and pianoforte, and extending his acquaintance with the great masters ; early and late he is teaching—probably the most fatiguing of all work. If, amid the anxiety and toil of a professional life, he did find himself able to spare time for preparing for a stiff examination in Latin, mathematics, and a modern language, it is not likely his wearied brain would be equal to the work that would be required of it. The writer would not willingly be guilty of an exaggeration, but he believes that if a schoolmaster, who had an ear for music, but knew nothing of theory, and a fine musician, who knew no Latin or mathematics, started together for the purpose of obtaining a degree in music, and the candidates were of the same age and equal ability, and had the same perseverance and opportunities for study, the chances are that, if either ever arrived at the end of the course, the schoolmaster would not come in second. If musical degrees are given for knowledge and skill in *music*, it seems strange that they should be as much within the grasp of the unmusical scholar as that of the unlettered musician.

It is said that only 'educated' men ought to hold University degrees,

* The elder Herschel was in the early part of his life an organist and teacher of music.

† The writer has lately been informed by one of the learned and courteous Professors of Trinity, that the Dublin examination is not so difficult as he supposed, and that it is made as little formidable to candidates as possible. And it has been pointed out to him that, as the London Doctors of Music have a higher standing at their University than other doctors have at theirs, London is justified in requiring her musical graduates to matriculate.

and many agree with this, and hold that it is quite right that candidates for the degree of Mus. Bac. should be obliged to pass an examination in literary work. But the examinations are far too hard; they require too much of musicians. If the Universities had required candidates to pass some simple examination—such as the Oxford or the Cambridge *Junior* Local Examination—they would have asked no more than musicians might perhaps have done, and yet enough to guarantee that their musical graduates were men of some education. When men were admitted as candidates for musical degrees without any examination in literary work, probably uneducated men sometimes became Bachelors and Doctors of Music; and if the Universities, when they found the old scheme faulty, had insisted upon candidates passing a *really* elementary examination in Latin, mathematics, English subjects, and a modern language, no one could have complained of those learned bodies.*

But good musicians have cause to complain when they know that they are being debarred by the interposition of a stiff examination in literary work (which is not their proper subject) from appearing before the University Professors of Music in their true characters as musicians. Even to the many excellent musicians who have *not* altogether forgotten their Latin and mathematics, this examination is a stumbling-block, whilst the case of musicians who have forgotten their school-work must be more hopeless. Absolutely hopeless must be the case of those who never had what is called a good education; and yet some of these men, if they came before the Professor of Music, might be found to be musical geniuses. In the world's estimation, a musician who has a degree in music often takes precedence of one who has not; and it seems a little hard that the Universities should close their gates against really good men simply because they are not scholars.† Everyone knows experienced musicians —men of great musical skill and learning, and of cultivated taste—who can never take a degree, simply because they have not passed in the literary portion of the work in youth, and, busily engaged in earning a livelihood, cannot find the time, and bear the excessive mental exertion necessary to pass the examination in after-life. It is excessively hard on such men, that they are effectually shut out from obtaining a degree which very young men, fresh from a good school, can get without any very great difficulty.‡

* Since this appeared in the *Musical World*, Durham has commenced to hold examinations in music. The amount of literary work required of candidates is most reasonable.

† A clergyman remarked to the writer that he was glad that music was not required of candidates for a B.A. degree, though he thought 'it would be as reasonable to require it of them as to require Latin and mathematics of candidates for a musical degree.'

‡ The writer does not feel at liberty to mention the names of those with whom he has corresponded on this subject; but he may say that among those very high in office there are, or were, some who would be willing to see the examinations in the literary portion of the musical candidates' work made more simple.

But if the Universities at present demand far too much literary work of candidates for musical degrees, and force many a musician who desires to have a 'degree' to take a Colonial one, surely the council of no musical college should go to the other extreme and ignore the importance of a fair general education.

That an education is useful to musicians as well as to other people is certain. Some subjects are, indeed, of more practical utility than others to musicians, and on these stress might be laid. In a letter to the *Musical World* the writer ventured to express the hope that the College of Organists would hold examinations in literary work, leaving it to candidates themselves to decide whether they would sit for them or not. If the College held such examinations, one would fancy that papers would be set in arithmetic, English grammar, geography, English history, a modern language, and, perhaps, algebra. A fair knowledge of the first four is expected of all who claim to be educated people. Arithmetic is of much use to the musician. In some branches of musical study a knowledge of it is absolutely necessary. In the Middle Ages great attention was given to the study of scientific or speculative, as distinguished from practical, music; and we find music, together with arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy, forming a *quadrivium* of mathematical sciences. The early musicians must have been good mathematicians. Indeed, many of them distinguished themselves as astrologers, and no less worthies than John de Muris and Walter Odington are said to have excelled in that singular science. For a long time an acquaintance with the abstruse and speculative writings of Boethius was required of candidates for musical degrees. Happily we have changed all that, and music is no longer a branch of mathematics. But a knowledge of arithmetic is necessary to the student who wishes to follow intelligently the early history of music, which deals so much with the speculations of philosophers and theorists.* The great *composers* knew little or nothing of acoustics; certainly they could not have been acquainted with the recent discoveries in that branch of science, and they needed not the knowledge. Helmholtz points out that Palestrina generally uses the tetrards in the best positions, and adds that 'as the existence of combinational tones was not then known, we

* It is interesting and curious to read what Zarlino, a contemporary of Palestrina, thought about the education of musicians. According to this famous theorist, a man, in order to be a complete musician, must know arithmetic (to be able to calculate musical proportions) and geometry (to measure them), must understand the monochord and harpsichord (to try experiments and effects), must be able to tune (in order to accustom the ear to distinguish and judge of intervals), must be able to sing with truth and taste, and perfectly understand counterpoint, should be a grammarian (in order to write correctly and set words with propriety), should know the history of his art, should be a master of logic (to reason upon, and investigate the more abstruse parts of it), and of rhetoric (to express his thoughts with precision), and should know something of natural philosophy and the philosophy of sound (that his ears, being perfectly exercised and purified, may not be easily deceived).

can only conclude that his fine ear led him to do so.' But, rightly or wrongly, a knowledge of acoustics is required of music students, and in reading this science and the theory of temperament, practice in arithmetic (especially in fractions, ratio, and proportion, and in squaring, and extracting the square root of, numbers) is quite necessary. Even in double and multiple counterpoint a practised arithmetician would probably learn faster than a person who had neglected his arithmetic. In order to spare candidates useless labour, certain portions of the subject would not be asked for—such as interest, stocks, profit and loss, and cube root. No English Church musician would question the importance to him of a knowledge of the elements of English grammar. And it will probably be conceded that all organists should know the main outlines of English history, and have a fair knowledge of the continents and oceans, with their leading physical features, the division of continents into countries, and the government and religion and principal towns and places of interest in those countries. For the modern language German would probably be considered to be quite the best. It is a fine language, and, when the rudiments are once mastered, very fascinating, and it is, perhaps, as good mental training as Latin. A knowledge of it would be valuable to musicians, as English translations of many excellent German theoretical works are not published. Probably our examiners would permit candidates to substitute French or Italian for German, if they preferred to do so. To be able to read a little Italian would certainly be very useful. Whichever language candidates chose, fairly easy questions would be set in the grammar, and a bit of prose given for translation into English. If German is useful in enabling the musician to read many excellent modern treatises on music, a knowledge of Latin would be no less helpful if he wished to read the old Latin treatises. As much fine and interesting music has been written to Latin words, and Latin phrases occur in books on theory, an acquaintance with the language is, no doubt, useful to musicians. But, as regards the old treatises, the knowledge of Latin sufficient to enable men to read them is to be acquired only after very long study, and, after all, few men wish to become musical antiquaries. The old Church composers must have known some Latin. In his well-known book Albrechtsberger relates a charming little story about himself and Haydn, and permits us to see a canon which he sent with a few lines of Latin—probably of his own composing—to that delightful composer. But on the whole, Latin, beyond enabling them to understand the sense of the words of many fine Church compositions, is not of much use to modern organists, and we should not expect to find it in the list of subjects for examination. Euclid would be a useless study for a musician. Admirably calculated to strengthen the reasoning powers, it would rather injure than improve the faculty of imagination so prized by artists. Algebra is of some use to students of the *science* of music as the formulas in acoustics are expressed algebraically; and perhaps a

paper might be set which would require an acquaintance with the elements of this science as far as easy fractions and simple equations. But as so slight a knowledge of the subject would not be of much use—and more could not reasonably be expected of musicians—probably the authorities would deem it better to omit algebra.

The subjects, then, of such an examination as we have been imagining would be arithmetic, English grammar, geography, English history, a modern language, and, perhaps, a little algebra. A sound knowledge of the elements of each subject would be required, special stress being laid on certain parts of arithmetic. Bad spelling would count against candidates. As the object of the examiners would be to see if candidates had carefully prepared the subjects, fair, straightforward questions would be set, and care would be taken to avoid perplexing students, or setting papers of too great difficulty. Musicians who decided to sit for the examination might prepare themselves for it without any very great labour ; and, as they would know beforehand that failing to pass it would *not* disqualify them for the examination in music, they would work comfortably, and have no cause whatever for uneasiness. The *Testamurs* of successful candidates would declare that they had passed the examination in the literary portion of the work.

While the examinations in literary work held by the Universities in connection with examinations in music are far too stiff, the examination here suggested as suited for a college of musicians would not be found too difficult. There can be no doubt that if optional examinations in literary work were held, and organists availed themselves of them, much good would be the result. And not the least important among the benefits the system would confer on organists, would be the certain rise of the profession in the public estimation.

INDEX.

Accompaniment, 134, 135, 136; intelligent and devotional, 118, 136; different styles of (orchestral, harmonical, and imitative), 139-141
Altos, 158
Ambrose, St., 58, 197
'Amens,' in the service, musically rendered, 33
Anthem, the, 39, 43 and note, 132, 158 note
Antiphonal singing, 58, 163
Architects and church organs, 67
Arrangements, modern, of old tunes, 18, 19
Ascham, Roger, 198
Astrologers, musical, 209
Augustine, St., 29, 47

Bach, 124, 128, 130
Barrel-organs, 192
Beza, 198, 202
Bishop of Lichfield, the, on choristers, 161
Boethius, 209
Boys and women, 155
Boy singers, 17; at cathedrals, 146; at churches, 146; requirements, 147; objections to, 151; their behaviour, 151, 159; management of them, 151; untrustworthy, 152, 153; mixed with women, 152; their performance, 153; a source of trouble and anxiety, 154; their worthlessness known at Rome, 154; Pietro della Valle's opinion of them, 155
Brethren, Bohemian and Moravian, 200, 201

Cathedrals, the effect of the choral service in, 28
Cathedral music of the sixteenth century, 190; of the seventeenth, 192
Cathedral service, the, 189, 190, 191; not used in parish churches, 191; suppressed, 192, 195
Chancel choirs, women in, 82, 147
Chants, Ambrosian, source of, 58
Chants, Anglican, 54; alterations in, 54; minor, when used, 54; changed during a psalm, 55
Chants, Gregorian, 55, 57 (see *Gregorian Music*)
Chanting the Psalms, objections to, 41; common faults in, 163 note
Chapel establishments of the nobility, 187
Charles II., his influence, 193; his musicians, 193
Choir, the, at choral celebrations, 42; often unfavourably placed in church, 67; the west gallery position, Part II., chap. i.; in the chancel, 68 and notes, 70; voluntary, 148, 165; surpliced, 149, 150; balance and quality of the voices, 157; admitting new members, 158, 159, 160; practice and instruction, 163, 164; unpleasantness and its causes, 165; strikes, 165, 166; true use of a choir, and its use by Ritualists, 69 note
Choirs in French Roman Catholic Churches, 205
Choir-masters, when needed, 169, 186; their power, 172, 173; uselessness, 173; unpleasantness with organists, 174, 175
Choral celebrations, 35; supposed arguments for them, 36; the Holy Communion made like a Mass, 36; which parts of the Holy Communion may be sung, 38; the Agnus Dei and Benedictus, 39; the Holy Communion rendered in plain-song and Mass music, 49
Choral service, the, arguments for and against, 23-35; at New York, 25; with orchestral accompaniment, 25; effect of the music, 29; often a failure musically, 30, 34, 35; musical Litanies, Creeds, etc., 31-33; not

understood by the poor and ignorant, 51 ; in country churches, 52
Choräle, 5, 15, 18, 19, 141, 201
Choristers, management of, 120 ; quarrelling and jealousy of, 148, 149, 165 ; surpliced 'for decency,' 150 note ; in church, 159 ; social position and morality, 159, 160, 161, 162 ; irreverence, 162
Church music, good, 22 and note ; its purpose, 25 note
Clergymen using poor psalmody, 5, 6 ; indifference of some, 3 ; often misunderstood by organists, 178, 183
Clerical musicians, famous, 181
Clerk, the parish, 191
Communicant test, the, 121 and note, 161
'Composers,' 14, 119 note
Composers of church music, old, the pre-Reformation, 187 ; living at the time of the Reformation, 187 ; in Elizabeth's reign, 189
Confession, General, the, 32
Congregational singing, 24, 29, 47 ; the music suited for it, and the congregational compass, 43, 44 ; practice, 45 ; how it may be improved, 46 ; needs an organ, 132 ; accompaniment of it, 134
Cooper, George, 122
Cosyns, 203
Craving, the popular, for something new, 20, 194
Creeds, musical, 32, 33, 42, 49
Cromwell, Oliver, 196, 199
Crotch, Dr., 124
Curates and church music, 174, 176, 184

DAMAN, William, 203
David, full of praise, 8
Daye, John, 203
Deadness in the responding and singing, 36, 37
Doric tunes, 15, 19
Drawing people to church, 150
Dykes, Dr., on Gregorian music, 61

ECHEIA, the, 74
Edward VI., his first Prayer-book appealed to by Romanizers, 50 ; his chapel and composers, 188
Elizabeth, her chapel music, 190 ; composers, 189 ; organists, 190 ; a good musician ; her influence, 190 ; the Injunctions, 190
Enthusiasm, properly directed, 40
Enthusiasts, musical, 24, 25, 39, 40
Este, 203
Evangelicals, some, imitating the Ritualists, 150
Examinations for organists in literary work, 206-211
Expression, false, 137

FANCY stops, 105, 124
Fashion, 21, 67
Feeling, devotional, 118 and note, 120, 129, 130
Florid psalm tunes, 16 ; composers of, 17
Franc, Guillaume, 202
Fugal tunes, 16
Fugues, 117, 128
Full swell, the, 134

GALLERY, the west, 67 ; why it is often abandoned, 68, 69, 71 ; not impossible to render the choral service therein, 68 ; arguments for it, 80-83 ; effect of music in it, 83 ; the size and plan of one, 84, 85 ; further particulars, 85
Gibbons, Orlando, 192
Goudimel, 202
Grand old tunes, 15 ; effect of, 16 ; many unknown in England, 19
Great Rebellion, the, 192, 195
Gregory, Bishop of Rome, 57
Gregorian hymn-tunes, 18 and note
Gregorian music, 171 ; its tonality, 57 ; antiquity of, 58 ; unsuitable for use now, 58 ; when effective, 59 and note ; not suited for our liturgy, 60 ; in the Church of Rome, 60 and note ; Dr. Dykes' remarks, 61-63 ; Mendelssohn's, 63 ; difficulties in, 61
Gregorian society, a, 59 note

HENRY VIII., church music and organs in his reign, 188
Hilary, 197
Hymns, many are unsatisfactory, 6, 7, 10 ; gloomy and sentimental, 8, 9 ; cheerful, stirring hymns, 10 ; dreadful hymns on the Passion, 9 ; some cannot be sung without the sense being lost or perverted : reasons for this, 11
Hymn-books and Psalters, old, 201-204
Hymn tunes, for street services and for church, 4, 5, 6 ; not suited rhythmically to the words, causing ludicrous perversions of the sense, 12 and note ; not always satisfactory, 13, 14 ; the new style of tune, 14, 21 ; faults in hymn tunes, 14 ; adapted, 14, 15 ; good tunes, characteristics

of, 15; grand old tunes (Lutheran, Calvinistic, and imitations of them), 15; *choräle*, 15; Scotch tunes, 15; Old English, 15; Doric, 15; florid and fugal, 16; changes in, 18; recent alterations of old tunes, 18, 19; melodious tunes laid aside, 20; transposing, 45

INCUMBENTS, their treatment of organists not always considerate, 178, 180, 181, 184
Incumbents and church music, 166, 177, 181-186
Instruments, ancient, 140, 141
Intoning, 26, 33, 189; not authorized; its probable origin, 38

JEROME, 198
Josiah, dirges for, 9

KEY-RELATIONSHIP, 55 note
Kyries, musical, 32

LE JEUNE, Claude, 202
Litany, the, 188; read or sung? 41, 42; strange and irreverent renderings of, 31, 32
Liturgy, the, 26, 38, 53 (see *Prayer-book*)
Lollards, 197
Lord's Prayer, the, musically performed, 33, 49
Luther, 200, 201; on hymns, 7; on church music, 48 note; on Gregorian music, 61 note
Lutheran tunes (see *Choräle*)

MACE, Thomas, 192, 198
Marot, Clement, 202
Meddlesome people, 165, 184, 185
Melodious tunes, 15, 20
Merbecke, 188, 189
Metrical psalmody, 191, 197-205; early psalm-singers, 197; popular, 198, 199, 203; effects of, 198; how used by the Puritans, 199; in Scotland, 199; in private devotion, 199; in our churches, 200
Milton, 196
Monotone, the, 26, 31
Music, the choice and direction of the, 173, 182-186
Music, the powers of, 28
Music in prayer, 31, 34
Musical study in the Middle Ages, 209

'OLD HUNDREDTH,' the, 29, 202
'Old Version,' the, 203
Oratorios in church, 30, 48, 83, 99
Oratorio performances, a strange objection to, 161
Organ, the uses of it, 131-142
Organ, silent, 137; feeble use of the, 136
Organ, good qualities it must possess, 87; recent improvements in, 88; defects in, 88; the number of stops it should have, 89; what kind of stops, 89, 90, 91, 94; hints for drawing up a specification, 91 note; organ-building, good and bad, 92, 93; cheap organs, 92, 93; deceptive appearances, 94; restorations, 95; builders' estimates, 95-97; the appearance of the organ, 97; pitch, 98; tuning, 99; pipes, the scaling of the, 100; metal for the pipes, 100, 101; suggestions, 102, 103; specifications, 105-115
Organ:
  Action, 87, 88, 92, 96
  Bellows, 95
  Case, 97
  Choir Organ, use of, 91; its contents, 91 note; its pipes, 101; a substitute for, 108
  Composition pedals, 88, 103
  Controllable, 88
  Engines, 101
  Foundation tone must predominate, 89, 94 note
  Front pipes, 97
  Great to Pedal coupler, 103
  Interchangeable combinational pistons, 88
  Metal for the pipes, 97, 100, 101 and note
  Pedal-board, 102
  Pipes, ingeniously borrowed, 94; scaling of the, 100
  Pitch, 98
  Shifting movements, 87, 88
  Sound-boards, 96
  Stops, incomplete, borrowed, 'half-stops,' 94
  Swell-box, 96
  Tone, 87, 91 note; of poor organs, 92
  Touch, 87, 96
  Ventils, 104, 114
  Voicing, 88, 92
  Winding, 87, 96
Organs in French Roman Catholic churches, 206
Organs may be a hindrance to worship, 134
Organs, crowded, 80
Organs, the position for—the west gallery and other positions dis-

cussed, Part II., chap. i.; general principles, 72-75; importance of position, its effect on the power and tone of the organ, 72, 81, 88, 89; position with regard to the choir, and congregation, 73; the organ at the end of an aisle, 75; in a chamber, 76; in various other positions, 77, 78; two organs, 79; two choirs but only one organ, 79, 80 (see *Gallery*)
Organs, injuries, derangements, and breakdowns, 77, 86, 93, 94, 98
Organ-builders and their work, 92, 95; agreements with; estimates, 95; famous, 192
Organist, the, a mere machine, 176, 181, 186
Organist, the, must not contend with the incumbent, 180
Organist, his qualifications, 116-121, 136; his calling an honourable one, 137
Organist, the, better concealed, 82; the place for his seat, 77 and notes, 80
Organist, the, and the choir, 165
Organists, their management of boys, 152
Organists, unqualified, 104, 170, 183
Organists, good and bad, 134, 170, 171, 172
Organists, their troubles, 180-182
Organists, vanity and irreverence of some, 123, 129, 130, 138, 139; may need to be controlled, 180, 186; bad feeling of some towards the clergy, 178 note
Organists, their views, 120 note; their education, 120, 121, 206, 210
Organists, amateur, 170, 171
Organists and organ lessons, 98
Organ music and true style of playing, 125, 128-130
Organ-chambers, 67, 71, 76, 77
Ouseley, Sir Frederick, 128; on organ-chambers, 76

Pace of tunes, 17, 163
Palestrina, 209
Parthenon, the, 40
'Paternosters,' 36, 49
Paxton Hood, a story of, 10 note
Pecuniary considerations, 72, 80, 92-94, 100, 158, 170
Plain-song, 49, 60, 188, 189, 190
Playford, John, 203
Playing the people out, 126 and note
Playing, extempore, 125, 128 and notes, 130
Playing, good, 117; monotonous, 134; noisy, 134; mechanical, 116, 125; fanciful, 138; expressive and feeling, 117, 125
Pointing, absurdities in, 56
Poor, good hymns and tunes for the, 4
Poor, the, driven from church, 52, 53
Poor music in church, 21
Practice for the congregation, 45
Prayer-book, what singing it authorizes, 38, 41; does not authorize musical Confession, etc., 39; opposed to a musical performance of the services in parish churches, 39; does not prescribe choral celebrations, 41; a simple and beautiful form of service, 52 (see *Liturgy*)
Precentors, when needed, 169, 186; unpleasantness with organists, 174, 175, 176
Processions, genuflexions, etc., 68 and note
Pronunciation, bad, 163 note
Psalms, the, joyful, 8, 9; sung to Gregorian music, 61
Psalmody, pace of it too great, 10; not cheerful, 22; the Lutheran, 201, 202; of the Calvinists and Huguenots, 202; English, 203; Scotch, 204
Public taste, the, 20, 124, 125
Purcell, 193, 194
Puritans and Puritanism, 192, 194-197, 199, 200; wherein their theory of worship differs from ours, 196

Ravenscroft, 203
Response-singing, 34, 155 note
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 125 note
Ritualism, 68, 150 and note
Romanizers, 36, 49-51

Sacred music cheerful in Bible times, 9; singing is the vehicle of praise and thanksgiving, and not of mourning and prayer, 8-10
Sanctus and Gloria, sung or read? 42
Saul, 29
Scheme for a surpliced chancel choir and a west-gallery organ, 79, 80
School teachers in choirs, 160 note
Services in parish churches in the olden time, 191, 196
Services of song, 30, 48
Service-music, 43, 44
Singers, professional, 158
Singing, the, at Nonconformist chapels, 20, 26
Singing, unaccompanied, 131, 132, 133
Singing at sight, 163

Snetzler, a story of, 95
Solo-singing, 162, 164, 165, 182
Strikes, 166
Surpliced choristers, 52, 149, 150 and note; supposed to represent angels in Paradise, 68 and note

TALLIS, 187-190
Tate and Brady, 204 and note
Te Deum, the, how it might be divided, 43 note
Temperament, systems of, 99
Tone of organs spoiled, 75, 76, 100
Trainers of voices, 146
Tunes, played over, 141
Two organs in churches, 78
Tye, 187-189

UNMUSICAL voices in the congregation, 46
Unpleasantness, a cause of, 175, 176

VALLE, Pietro della, on boy singers, 154
Versions, metrical, of the Lord's Prayer, etc., 200
Voluntaries, middle, 133; introductory, 125; concluding, 126-130
Voluntaries, many unsuitable, 120 and note, 127; use of them, 126, 133; should be appropriate, 127; *offertoires*, gavottes, and marches, 127, 129; examples of good voluntaries, [128
WALTHER, Johann, 201
Women singers, in the chancel, 82, 147 and note; absurd objections to, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149; their dress, 147; quality of voice, 147, 154; a serious objection to, 148, 149; used in Bible and early Christian times, 149; mixed with boys, 152, 153

ZARLINO, 209 note.

THE END.

Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row, London.